THE Lutheran Quarterly

Volume XIII FEBRUARY, 1961 Number 1

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
FRED W. MEUSER
Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
ARNOLD E. CARLSON
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

Circulation Manager
LOWELL J. SATRE
Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Trinity Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume XIII February, 1961 Number 1

CONTENTS

THEOLOGY, THE CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITY ..... *Conrad Bergendoff* 3

THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE YOUNG LUTHER, *Gottfried G. Krodel* 19

RECENT LINGUISTIC TRANSITION IN LUTHERANISM ..... *David L. Scheidt* 34

REFORM IN ROMAN CATHOLICISM ..... *Carl Umhau Wolf* 47

THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF ..... *Joseph H. Deibert* 67

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Young and Meiberg, *Spiritual Therapy* (P. E. Morentz) 73
Smart, *The Rebirth of Ministry* (W. D. Streng) 73
Martinson, *Marriage and the American Ideal* (D. Belgum) 74
Mace and Mace, *Marriage East and West* (F. M. Martinson) 75
Scharlemann, ed., *What, Then, Is Man?* (M. J. Heinecken) 75
Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man* (M. J. Heinecken) 77
Ziel, *The Natural Sciences and the Christian Message* (T. G. Tappert) 78
Childs, *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* (H. N. Bream) 79
Muckle, *Isaiah 1-39* (Robert Marshall) 80
Thexton, *Isaiah 40-66* (Robert Marshall) 80
Leupold, *Exposition of the Psalms* (H. N. Bream) 81
Grant, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (R. A. Bartels) 83
Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth* (N. K. Bakken) 84
Rexine, *Religion in Plato and Cicero* (D. H. Zinger) 85
Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (W. M. Zucker) 86
Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (W. M. Zucker) 87
Payne, *The Holy Fire* (F. W. Meuser) 88
Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy* (W. M. Zucker) 88
Harland, *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr* (W. H. Lazareth) 90
Osborn, *The Spirit of American Christianity* (F. W. Meuser) 91
Hopkin, *The Watchman* (J. Stensvaag) 92
Harkness, *The Providence of God* (L. Dale Lund) 92
Berry, *High Is the Wall* (F. M. Martinson) 93

CONTRIBUTORS

Conrad Bergendoff is president of Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois.

Gottfried G. Krodel is professor in the Department of Religion in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota.

David L. Scheidt is pastor of the Church of the Living Word in Roslyn, Pennsylvania.

Carl Umhau Wolf is pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Toledo, Ohio.

Joseph H. Deibert is professor of Practical Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in José C. Paz, Argentina.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are Paul E. Morentz, psychiatrist attached to Pacific Lutheran Seminary in Berkeley, Calif.; William D. Streng, professor of Christian Education in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa; David Belgum, professor of Pastoral Theology in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; Floyd M. Martinson, professor of Sociology in Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; Martin J. Heinecken, professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia; Howard N. Bream, professor of Biblical Studies in the Lutheran Seminary in Gettysburg, Pa.; Robert Marshall, professor of the Old Testament in the Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; Robert A. Bartels, professor of the New Testament in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; Norman K. Bakken, instructor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia; Donald H. Zinger, professor of Christianity in Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa; Wolfgang M. Zucker, professor of Philosophy and Religion in Upsala College in East Orange, N. J.; Fred W. Meuser, associate professor of Historical Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary in Columbus, Ohio; William H. Lazareth, assistant professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia; John Stensvaag, president of the Lutheran Free Church.

Theology, the Church and the University

By Conrad Bergendoff

I. Theology in the University

IT IS only a little over a century since John Henry Newman attempted to define the character of a university for the English-speaking world. *The Idea of a University* is a classic, and no one has surpassed him in his glowing sentences on the meaning of a liberal education. Developments since his day have deeply affected the programs of universities, and we may question some of the arguments of Newman concerning the scope of university education, but we still go back to him for his clear analysis of the function of education.

Not least is he still suggestive in the discussion of the relationship between the university and theology. For his lectures were inspired by the founding of a university where theology was to have a rightful place. He argues for such a place against those who would exclude theology from a modern university. *The Idea of a University* came after Newman's conversion to Rome, and the author equates Christianity and Roman Catholicism in a way we cannot follow. Nor is it altogether necessary, for in this statement he does not develop Roman doctrine, and a Protestant can easily substitute his own theology where Newman specifies Roman doctrine. The argument, in my mind at least, does not hinge on Roman or Protestant theology, but on the relation of the university to any theology. I am interested here in what Newman says of the character of the university, and shall go on later to the question of what theology, either his or ours, has to say in the university.

Newman yields to no one in granting an end to knowledge in itself. He wrote: "I consider Knowledge to have its end in itself. . . . It is as real a mistake to burden it with virtue or religion as with the mechanical arts. . . . Knowledge is one thing, virtue is another; good sense is not conscience, refinement is not humility, nor is largeness and justness of view faith. Liberal Education makes not the Christian, not the Catholic, but the gentleman. It is well to be a gentleman, it is well to have a cultivated intellect, a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dis-

passionate mind, a noble and courteous bearing in the conduct of life; —these are the connatural qualities of a large knowledge; they are the objects of a University, but they are no guarantee for sanctity or even for conscientiousness; they may attach to the man of the world, to the profligate, to the heartless."[1]

It is, then, the business of the university to teach knowledge—all knowledge. Granting that there is a question as to the origin of the term *universitas,* Newman would yet insist on the necessity of the university to teach universal knowledge and agreed with the historian Mosheim that Paris, "which exceeded all others in various respects, as well as in the number of teachers and students, was the first to embrace all the arts and sciences, and therefore first became a University" (p. 20). But because the true university must make all knowledge available to its students, that university which omits theology forfeits its right to the name. For why should one branch of human learning be neglected if the function of the university is to present the situation of all knowledge? The only possible answer is that men have come to question whether theology is a branch of knowledge, is a science as all the disciplines of the university must be. Newman of course contends that theology is a branch of knowledge and that no true university can omit it any more than it could omit, say, astronomy.

To the Protestant the attempt of Newman to explain the modern suspicion of theology as a body of knowledge is wholly partisan and unconvincing. He would trace back to the "religious changes of the sixteenth century" the contemporary tendency to hold "that Religion consists, not in knowledge, but in feeling or sentiment" (p. 27)—a view of religion that would rob it of all factual content and of any more claim to a university chair than "patriotism, gratitude, maternal affection," etc., have for a department in a university.

The point is of interest, because this would center in religious development itself any responsibility for lack of consideration as a branch of university learning. That such a change has taken place can hardly be denied. Something has happened to make sciences seem the hard realities of a university curriculum while religion is a vanishing phantom of a receding period of civilization. But it is not thereby proved

1 John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University* (Longmans, Green, 1891), pp. 120, 121. Page references in parentheses below are to this edition.

that the cause lay in religion. I would counter that the cause lies elsewhere, and principally in the philosophy of Descartes, who first severed truth into two parts, reserving for the physical, the material, the measurable the claim of being the substance of knowledge. From the time of Descartes we find the accent increasingly on the sensible, and a suspicion that what cannot be weighed or numbered belongs to a realm other than knowledge. Newman's bias blinded him to the true cause of the situation he deplored. But it is to his credit that he meets squarely the objection that theology is no fit subject for the university. A true university would recognize the Cartesian distinction, not eliminate a part of its program.

What has really happened is that the university has ceased to be neutral as over against all sciences it teaches and has adopted a limitation of its field to certain kinds of knowledge. Newman anticipated such a stand. "It will be said, that there are different kinds or spheres of Knowledge, human, divine, sensible, intellectual, and the like; and that a University certainly takes in all varieties of Knowledge in its own line, but still that it has a line of its own" (p. 25). But how can a university then claim to be teaching all knowledge? And what shall it exclude? "Are we to limit our idea of University Knowledge by the evidence of our senses?" Newman indicates what this would lead to. "Then we exclude ethics; by intuition? we exclude history; by testimony? we exclude metaphysics; by abstract reasoning? we exclude physics" (p. 25). It follows that the modern university has by its exclusion of theology taken sides in a controversy as to the meaning of knowledge, and admits only such knowledge as befits its metaphysical distinction of what is known.

If Newman had cause a century ago to complain of the one-sidedness of the university, certainly the happenings of the century have thrown the balances even more drastically out of equilibrium. For science and philosophy have usurped the place of religion in the curriculum and ushered in a new kind of intellectual reign. This Newman foresaw. The burden of one of his lectures was the inter-connections of the branches of learning. All the sciences are artificial divisions of the object of knowledge, and each science supplements the other. Geology, astronomy, physics, chemistry, all belong together, even though for purposes of teaching and learning they are for the moment made

distinct. Indeed, Newman finds the meaning of a liberal education in the ability of the cultivated mind to discover the relationship between the parts of knowledge.

The individual who knows only "his" field is least liberal. Robert Shaffer, of Indiana University, recently complained that the integrity of the university is destroyed by administrators and professors who lay undue emphasis on their own subjects. He quotes vice-president Harry Ransom of the University of Texas: "The university must not prize, even when it must acknowledge, artificially neat little packages which are the stock in trade of many departmental systems. It must recognize the unity of knowledge."[2] Knowledge is power and freedom when it can pass easily across the boundaries of knowledge and understand the hidden connections between various areas of learning. To leave theology out of the picture, and to put together the other parts, distorts the true view and gives no correct reading of reality. Just because all knowledge is inter-related, and religion enters into so many areas of human experience, the omitting of theology does violence to truth. And further, when the other sciences are not held in their proper place by the position of each, including theology, the dropping of any one means that the others will try to fill the vacuum. Where theology is excluded, the other sciences move into its place, not only eliminating its influence, but magnifying their own out of all due proportion. "I have urged," Newman said, "that, supposing Theology be not taught, its province will not simply be neglected, but will be actually usurped by other sciences, which will teach, without warrant, conclusions of their own in a subject matter which needs its own proper principles for its due formation and disposition" (p. 98). Will anyone deny that the "other sciences" have done exactly this during the century that has elapsed?

Five years after Newman gave his lectures in Dublin, outlining his conception of a university, Charles Darwin sent a letter to an American botanist, Asa Gray, proposing a new explanation of relationships in nature. His *Origin of Species* introduced into man's thinking a view of creation that has colored all modern thinking. As a science biology came to demand a very great place in the university. But some would agree with Newman that because theology was practically crowded

2 *School and Society,* March 14, 1959, p. 101.

out of the university, biology overstepped its boundary and was responsible for theories which went beyond the facts. Theology might have raised a cautioning hand, had it been present, but in its absence superstitions gathered around the discoveries of Darwin. We can accept the data Darwin gathered, but the wild notions that followed in his train regarding the relationship of man to other forms of creation needed a critical analysis for which we are still waiting. To explain the structure and actions of man by exceedingly vague and hypothetical pictures of an ancestry of untold millions of years is hardly scientific when it is still a matter of serious debate how much one generation inherits from the other. To go on and deny to man any unique character because of real or fancied relationships to the bodily structures of other creatures betrays a bias of reason rather than any fair use of it, though it is in the name of reason that some of the most irrational of conclusions have been drawn from biological data. In the university this type of thinking has passed unchallenged, whereas the presence of a vital theology would have been able to demand that by its own criteria this science hold itself within the bounds of its data. The result is that not only has much passed for science which was pure speculation—a metaphysics that was allowed, though it was because of its metaphysics that theology was banned—but the university itself lost its neutral character of imparting knowledge and lent its authority to one kind of knowledge as against another.

A decade later another epoch-making book appeared, which not only destroyed the balance of the university curriculum but was destined to destroy, in many places, the university itself. This was *Das Kapital,* by Karl Marx. In the name of the science of political economy Marx assembled a wealth of material but drew from it conclusions which are every bit as metaphysical as any theories of theology. The idea of a class struggle and a dictatorship of the proletariat became the creed of a new religion which has determined the course of modern history. Here again, theology should have stood its ground and denied the crass materialism and false humanitarianism of Marx, within the university at least. But the poison of dialectical materialism pervaded these precincts too, and even in America, thirty years ago, there were those who in the name of science were willing to condone Communism's attitude toward religion as an opiate of the people. And by its own indifference to religion the university slanted its teaching of knowledge

in favor of a secularism which is close kin to communism. Newman's thesis that all of the sciences are related to one another carried with it the corollary that they all influence one another. When theology is excluded, its influence is lost, but the others are still colored by one another, and it would be hard to deny that economic determinism has had its effect not only on political science but also on psychology, and history, and sociology, and philosophy itself.

About the same time that Marx was contending for an economic interpretation of history, Newman was seeking to defend the university against a utilitarianism which sought to measure a liberal education by its practicality. The university was criticized as teaching subjects of no immediate value, and the attackers would substitute for the traditional classics the kind of knowledge which would benefit the learner by preparing him more directly for his later career. Here Newman was fighting a losing battle, for the broadening of educational opportunity inevitably meant that teaching would become more technical and vocational. The European universities were being forced to admit the newer sciences, which had grown up in technical institutes more than in the cloistered university walls. When land-grant universities came into being in America, they reshaped the traditional university curriculum. Newman seems not to have thought of the university as the discoverer of new knowledge, though his objection would not have been against such knowledge—was not the University obligated to teach all knowledge? Rather he would have questioned the way it was taught. For it would probably be given an undue importance, because of its novelty, and the function of the university was to show the relationship between sciences, giving each its due proportion. He objected to the claim of utility, for this usefulness was not a substitute for a liberal education wherein the mind was trained to judge between various uses and various learning. It was just the lack of proportion that revealed the uneducated man, who always thought that only his learning was important. "There will be," he wrote, "this distinction as regards a professor of Law, or of Medicine, or of Geology, or of Political Economy, in a University and out of it, that out of a University he is in danger of being absorbed and narrowed by his pursuit, and of giving lectures which are the lectures of nothing more than a lawyer, physician, geologist, or political economist; whereas in a University he will just know where he and his science stand; he has come to it, as it were, from a

neight, he has taken a survey of all knowledge, he is kept from extravagance by the very rivalry of other studies, he has gained from them a special illumination and largeness of mind and freedom and self-possession, and he treats his own in consequence with a philosophy and a resource, which belongs not to the study itself, but to his liberal education" (pp. 166, 167). This liberal education was of the highest usefulness to the community but it was not due to its bearing on any one vocation, but because of its preparation for all vocations. A university that trains a man for one narrow specialty would not be worthy of its name, however worthy the occupation might be. And we can imagine Newman's scorn of a system of education that judges any knowledge as valuable only as it can be put to immediate application.

The objective which Newman consistently upholds for the university is such a presentation of all learning that the student may have a broad view of the whole in order to judge the meaning of any part. When theology is omitted, an important phase of human culture escapes the attention of the student, and his judgment suffers. Newman complains that the English language has no one word for the ideal state of the intellect comparable to the word "health," which describes the desired condition of the body, or the word "virtue," relating to the desired condition of the moral nature. He uses the words "Thought," "Reason," "Philosophy" to indicate that learning consists not merely in the acquisition of knowledge, which is necessary, but in the exercise of the rational powers of the mind upon the information acquired. "That perfection of the Intellect, which is the result of Education, and its *beau ideal,* to be imparted to individuals in their respective measures, is the clear, calm, accurate vision and comprehension of all things, as far as the finite mind can embrace them, each in its place and with its own characteristics upon it" (p. 139). Obviously mere learning of ever so many facts will not result in such a vision or comprehension, which can only come from an exercise or operation of the mind as it gives form and pattern to the mass of knowledge it receives. The training of the rational faculty requires the presentation of all the branches of learning, so that the relationships between them may be discerned and the mind may be in a position to pass judgment. Only then can we speak of a reasonable, or philosophic, mind, the goal of a liberal education. If we inquire as to the usefulness of such an education, we would find that it is an end in itself and is not to be confused with other ends

which may be reached in other ways. Health is a sufficient goal for bodily training. What either mind or body does in its healthy state belongs to other realms.

This brings us back to the point that we must not claim too much for the educated mind, for the gentleman. "Their professors and their admirers," Newman held, "persist in taking them for what they are not, and are officious in arrogating for them a praise to which they have no claim. Quarry the granite rock with razors, or move the vessel with a thread of silk; then may you hope with such keen and delicate instruments as human knowledge and human reason to contend against those giants, the passion and the pride of man" (p. 121). In other words, important as a liberal education may be, it gives neither bodily health nor moral virtue. An educated man is not necessarily a good man. Even the inclusion of theology in the university curriculum will not make the scholar virtuous. It should make him more reasonable, but we need something else than knowledge to make him a Christian. There are limitations to a university education, and it should be a part of education to recognize them. For all their importance, scientists, engineers, scholars, yes, even preachers, may be overly regarded by the populace as it senses that education gives such men superior power and place. The truly educated scientist will see his attainments in perspective and know that even his knowlege is partial, and his character quite below his intellectual attainments. "Knowledge puffs up," the Apostle Paul long ago remarked. If intellectual excellence were regarded as only part of human quality, such inflation might be held in check. In one passage Newman contrasts the intellectual's modesty with the Christian's humility, claiming that the two are very different traits. Something more than knowlege is needed; a university education is good only in its own realm of human experience. Since even theology will not remedy this defect, we must look elsewhere for help. This brings us to the church, and what its relationship should be not only to the university but to the culture of the age.

II. The Church and the University

Thus far we have been considering the nature of the university and the place theology rightly might claim in its structure. We have used the term "theology" in a general sense, as Newman used it, count-

ng it a science of equal rank with every other branch of learning. But t is necessary to scrutinize this term more closely and discover both what we mean by it and how to relate it to the church. In the process we may discover why theology has not maintained itself in the univer-sity, as well as what the limitations are of the university in human life.

The decline of theology in the university is in some measure due o the developments within theology as a unified discipline. Newman wanted to place the blame on the Reformation. We would differ with his interpretation, seeking the cause rather in philosophy since Des-cartes. Of course, there has appeared since the Reformation a seem-ngly unbridgeable gap between Roman Catholic and Protestant the-ology. This in itself is no reason for the refusal to give theology a university recognition. In fact some of the older universities of Europe solved the problem by setting up both a Protestant and a Roman Cath-olic faculty within their walls, leaving it to the theologians themselves o carry on their controversies. Logically, this seems the proper solu-tion. The study of political science is not barred from the university because the American people are divided, principally, into Republican and the Democratic parties. The claims of both are proper subject mat-ter of the department of political science, and a professor who is un-willing to try to understand both parties would be out of place in the university. So the religious division itself does not explain, or justify, the exclusion of the study of religion.

More important is the intolerance of the divisions of the church which precludes the objective study of the whole, or of the parts. Uni-versities do not operate in either a social or a political vacuum. Always they reflect the temper and outlook of the nations which support them. When the wars of religion divided the countries of Europe into Roman Catholic and Protestant nations, the universities of the countries re-flected the religious loyalty of the government. Where a clear majority of the people were in our camp, the universities were there too. The uni-versities of Italy and Spain and Austria were Roman Catholic, those of England, Holland, and Scandinavia were Protestant. Only where mixed populations forced a compromise, as in Germany, both confes-sions were represented in the faculties. Certainly the divisions weakened the force of theology, and polemics often became the temper of theo-logical discussion. As the newer sciences gained international status

they had the power to bring scientists together, across national boundaries, and it is not surprising that science seemed to unite what religion had severed.

In Protestantism the consequences were the more unfortunate inasmuch as the divisions here became almost as bitter as those between Protestantism and Catholicism. England was rent between Anglicanism and Presbyterianism and Congregationalism and Methodism. Protestant Germany became Lutheran, as did Scandinavia. Baptists were nowhere popular, and access to the universities often was denied to any but the officially favored. Everywhere theology was interpreted as sectarian or denominational. It is hardly surprising that the witness of the church to the university was one of division and of controversy.

The pattern was reproduced in America. Theology at Harvard meant Congregational, at William and Mary and King's (Columbia), Anglican, at Princeton, Presbyterian, at Brown, Baptist theology. When Franklin in Pennsylvania and Jefferson in Virginia drew plans for a more comprehensive university, they would not allow denominational partiality and were ready to leave out the study of religion. Until the period of the Civil War most of the colleges were under the auspices of a church body, but state universities were arising, and before long the great universities of America were thought of as secular institutions where the study of theology was not a part of the curriculum.

What happened on the level of higher education was taking place on the lower, almost simultaneously. Horace Mann declared that he was not averse to including the teaching of religion in the public school system he was slowly drafting, but the divisions among the churches made it impossible for him to satisfy all, and hence none could be admitted.

The result in America has been an isolation of the study of religion. Roman Catholicism has gone about building up a complete system of education, from kindergarten to university, teaching Roman Catholic doctrine as its witness to learning. The Protestant denominations have continued a relationship with their colleges, but the latter have not distinguished themselves by any contributions to theology, leaving this to theological seminaries, which in only exceptional cases have thought of themselves as departments of universities. Meanwhile the universities, both public and private, have approached the ideal of com-

prehensiveness in universal knowledge but have paid little attention to theological study. Lately, as at Iowa, religion is seeking re-entry to the university, but it is at a side entry, not through the main portals, while Colwell at Chicago and Pusey at Harvard have exerted personal influence in favor of religion in the university. Their faculties have shown little enthusiasm for the project.

A psychological consequence, so far as Protestantism is concerned, is the attitude of self-defense assumed by religious educators, and a sense of security within the walls of their own church. There is a kind of Protestantism which bears no witness to the university because it is unwilling to meet the other disciplines on their own level. A reference to this defect is found in a recent study by a commission of educators who have studied the place of religion in teacher education.[3] I quote at length because I believe this description of the present situation is significant.

> Our ignorance of religion and the role it plays in modern society is most impressive. That our teachers need a greater understanding of the influence of religion in the experience of children and in our culture would appear to be almost self-evident. The single most difficult barrier is the widespread attitude toward the study of religion current in most institutions of higher learning. It simply is not looked upon as an appropriate area of inquiry. It is neither one of the liberal disciplines nor one of the social or physical sciences. On the face of it, it would appear as if there really were no place for the study of religion in public institutions of higher learning.
>
> Many academic men and many clergymen in the past have taken essentially this view. Particularly the Protestant clergy in the tradition of pietism have not looked upon religion as a proper subject of inquiry. This may very well be one of the reasons that Protestant Christian realists have not associated themselves with the national Philosophy of Education Association. They do not prepare papers for the national or regional conferences. Neither of the two yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education which devote a chapter to each proposed philosophy of education in the United States contains a chapter presenting the views of the commonest single ideology in American culture. Each contains a competent chapter presenting the Catholic view, and each contains a chapter on Christian idealism. The more recent volume offers a sympathetic interpretation of the Marxist philosophy of education.

3 A. L. Sebaly, ed., *Teacher Education and Religion* (1959), pp. 68-70. This is a study carried on by a commission of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The quotation is from the essay prepared by E. J. Kircher, professor of Education, Ohio State University.

It is true that the history of this society shows a dominance of naturalistic thought, but it is equally true that the Catholic scholar and clergy have long been active participants and respected members. . . . Why the Protestant scholar and clergy have absented themselves from regional and national philosophy of education societies is a question that is more easily asked than answered. . . . Perhaps the Protestant scholars address themselves only to church-related colleges, attend only their own educational conferences, and write only for their own professional publications. Even their textbooks are written as if they were to be read by those already committed, written by those within the faith for those within the faith. This kind of parochialism makes them unsuitable for use in the liberal universities or colleges of a pluralistic society.

The results are clear. . . . In educational theory, Protestant thought is not present and is not missed. In most courses in education it is omitted because it simply doesn't exist in the thought of the educator—because it has no contemporary representation. . . . Like everything else in the university, it must come in as, or be directly related to, an intellectual discipline, or it should stay out.

This is a severe stricture on Protestant theology in the university, but, I fear, not unfair. For a long time Protestantism in America felt itself as semi-officially the religion of the nation, at least of the cultured citizenry. When it was challenged by secularism it fell back on the churches supporting its schools and was content to assure these of its intellectual worth. Roman Catholicism has been a minority group and had to fight its way against the popular current. In so doing it has learned an independence and a resistance which Protestantism has not felt in need of. Rome, of course, is united, but any Protestant theologian knows that despite all differences there is a deep unity among the divided churches as one against the unbelief of the age. Protestantism is beginning to make public proclamation of the unity it has in Christian truth in the modern ecumenical endeavor. It has taken terrible world wars and an aggressive secularism to convince Protestantism that it has a common witness—in the world, and in the university. It may yet find what Christians in Europe learned in war years, that at some points on its front against modern paganism Protestantism can cooperate with Roman Catholicism—a thought, I realize, that is still strange in this country and apt to be bitterly assailed by an emotional anti-Romanism which characterizes many Protestants. I am under no delusion about unity with Rome, but a Christianity that does not recognize what it has in common, as well as what it cannot agree on, forfeits its intellectual influence in the university, where one seeks a description

of facts. A Protestantism which builds on ignorance of Roman theology is weaker than one which knows and yet differs. Of course, the other side of the coin is that Roman Catholics will have to recognize that the Christian church comprehends Protestants as well as Catholics, and that in this country theirs will be one of many churches. The Protestant fear of Rome is that it may eventually become a majority and then deny to the minority the rights it enjoyed when it was a minority. This political fear is more potent than any religious fear, or fear of doctrinal supremacy. Until this tension is relieved it is doubtful that Christian theology will be accorded a place in our universities as an intellectual discipline, or that the church will be able to bear an effective witness to the university.

I have left to the last one of the most important aspects of the relationship of university and church. From the high and weighty things that Newman has to say about the value of a liberal education in the true university, one might draw the conclusion that such an education makes a person religious, and that religion could not exist without the university. This is certainly not Newman's meaning. Indeed, he explicitly declared that such an education does not make a Christian, and it might turn out that this education was possessed by a profligate. A liberal education, in Newman's words, makes a gentleman. We like to believe that there is a close connection between a gentleman and a Christian, and some interpretations of Christianity came close to identifying the two—to be a gentleman is to be a Christian. But a true theology is aware that a gentleman can be a scoundrel, and the worst of sinners may sport a gentleman's appearance. No, a liberal education is a finely polished tool, but the character of the man who wields the tool depends, not on the university, but on other institutions of society.

One great difference between the university and the church is in the object of each. "Intellectual excellence" is the definition we arrived at for the university. The object of the Christian church is to win men for Jesus Christ. Faith in Christ means a higher than human loyalty. It means that somewhere on life's road we meet with One risen from the dead who can convince us that our life has been really a death from which he would raise us to live with him. In the midst of the kingdoms of this world we behold a kingdom not of this world, whose maker is God and whose nature is following Christ rather than

our own ways. We become convinced that we are not our own, that freedom consists in the choice of whom we will serve—the spirit of worldliness or the Spirit of God. We learn the meaning of sin, of sorrow for sin, of forgiveness of sin, of mastery over sin through a power greater than ourselves. This revelation of a Lord and Saviour has come through the Scriptures, and as we grow in spiritual experiences we come to recognize that the Bible is unlike any other book, that in a unique sense it is the Word of God to us. On this Gospel the church of the ages has been built, and in the fellowship of the church we sense a power and a life that we believe is from God himself. The mission of the church in the world is to witness to the source of life which is in Christ—and this is the witness of the church to the university, which is made up of sinful men and women who can find help in no other name or place, whatever be their intellectual capacities.

Thus the witness of the church is no different to the university than to any other group of individuals. But we need to distinguish between the theology which the church wants to contribute to the curriculum of the university, making it more worthy of its name, and the Gospel which it proclaims to invite men to discipleship. In the teaching of religion the faculty member presents objectively the place of man's faith in human life and the effects of the church in the history of mankind. This is the "science" of theology which earns it a place in the university. This, interestingly, is what the educational commission which produced the volume *Teacher Education and Religion* pleaded for even on lower levels of education. "Our position," the report states, "is that any religion, recognized as such by scholars, can be the subject of disciplined, intellectual inquiry, and therefore has significance relative to other studies including science."[4] Many educators feel that this kind of fair, sympathetic presentation of the facts of religion should be encouraged in the common schools of our land. In neither the lower nor the higher schools should it be the purpose to "convert" any student. In this realm, as we have emphasized, it would require a united approach of the Christian churches to their "educational" witness to all of education.

But in the realm of seeking commitment to any particular church we must not expect either the preparatory schools or the university to

4 *Ibid.*, p. 163.

go beyond their "educational" function. The church may not expect the university to do its work for it. The university is not a religious fellowship, whereas the church calls the Christian, not to a solitary life, but to a communal experience. The Spirit of Christ dwells only in a body, and defective and fragmented as the churches are, they are yet the only forms of the Body of Christ through which his life may flow into his members. The requirements for participation in these bodies that are Christ's manifestation on earth are not intellectual, but spiritual. A humble and contrite spirit, a trusting faith in Christ, a dedication to his kingdom—these are not the entrance requirements nor the graduation requirements of the university. The church must be the church in its witness to the university and not confuse growth in mental power with growth in grace. It must ever warn the student that his mind is a gift of God to be used for God's purposes, even as all of life's gifts involve a stewardship, but it must also warn the student that even the highest of academic distinctions mean nothing in God's school unless there be faith and an eager desire to serve the Lord with those attainments. The church must ever be on guard lest its own representatives put the culture of the mind above the culture of the soul and give the impression that the kingdom of God consists in an abundance of learning and in the refinement of manners. In the time of Christ the university was represented by the Scribes, and we know the witness of Christ to his university contemporaries. Whether the church be on or near or off the campus, its message is the same—and never to be identified as the voice of the university.

From this point of view the church college appears to serve a dual purpose. As far as a liberal arts education is concerned there is no essential difference between a college and a university. Since the American university does not include theology in its courses, the church college can be even more comprehensive than the liberal arts of the university, especially if the college presents the major divisions of human learning to its students. But the church college must teach all these divisions in their own right, and not as subordinate to theology. The sciences, the humanities, the social studies, the arts must be treated from their own presuppositions and according to their own principles. That they be given their true proportion is as important as the inclusion of theology, and the presence of the study of religion is an aid

to keeping them in perspective. As a college, then, the church college performs the function of a liberal arts university.

But since the church is not united, and religion in America has to be proclaimed through a variety of church bodies, the church college also serves the purpose of a church in its witness to education. Besides the academic exposition of the meaning of religion in culture, the church college can witness in the academic community to the meaning of worship, the nature of Christian fellowship, and the character of Christian discipleship. The church college is not a church and does not use the academic program as a means of proselyting or converting. But the college which is an arm of the church may provide means of explaining and cultivating the Christian qualities of its members. Were the nation united, as even England was not when the Anglican Church witnessed to the university through its churchly functions, we might not need church colleges, for the church would be on the campus as well as in the curriculum. But in the pluralistic society of America the church college is essential if religion is to have a place in the field of higher education.

The Lord's Supper in the Theology of the Young Luther

By Gottfried G. Krodel

I

THE first part of our century has seen a tremendous rise in research on the young Luther's life and theology.[1] The discovery and publication of his classroom lectures from 1513 to 1518 have enabled us to share in this vital period of the Reformer's development. These lecture notes were his most personal documents, and Luther never expected them to be printed. When he was asked to make them public he hesitated to comply; only after long consideration did he finally turn over his notes to the publisher.[2]

Historians and theologians have opened these documents for us with highest technical skill, yet with deep sensitivity for the Reformer's thought. Innumerable publications show the results of this painstaking research. Today it seems almost impossible for any one man to oversee the material dealing with the young Luther. And yet many fields of Luther's theology in this period are still unknown territory to us.

One reason for this is the method with which the documents were handled. There is only one center for research interest, and this dominates the approach to the sources: When and in what form did Luther for the first time express his doctrine of justification, which was the basic issue that separated him from Rome?

This central problem is viewed from various angles, such as the relationship between scholastic philosophy and biblical theology, the understanding of faith as theology of the cross, the interpretation of Christ, Luther's exegetical principle, his understanding of the church, of law, ethics, and so on. Justification by faith, however, is always considered to be the underlying principle of the understanding of Luther's

1 With reference to this development, usually called Luther Renaissance, cf. L. C. Green, "Luther and Melanchthon," in *The Mature Luther*. Martin Luther Lectures, III (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1959), 154 ff.

2 Cf. Luther to Spalatin, September 9, 1516 *(WA Briefwechsel* 1, Nr. 21, 5-10). Luther to Lang, March 1, 1517 *(WA Br.* 1, Nr. 35, 12-14).

theology and of the analysis of the source material. Great efforts have been made to establish the particular point at which Luther's thinking began to differ from the Roman Church. All other theological statements and all further acts of Luther were somehow to be related to this original divergence.

Amazing results were achieved.[3] Almost every date in the Reformer's life between 1508 and 1519 has been linked with the beginnings of the new encounter with the Gospel. O. Ritschl,[4] R. Seeberg,[5] H. Boehmer,[6] K. Holl,[7] J. Heckel,[8] G. Ebeling,[9] and W. Jetter[10] all considered the first lectures on the Psalms as the earliest evidence of this new theology. These lectures were also evaluated as documents in which the new understanding of the Gospel broke through. E. Vogelsang[11] saw this occurring in Luther's exegesis of Psalm 70, and H. Bornkamm[12] and G. Rupp[13] agreed with him; E. Hirsch,[14] and apparently also W. Quanbeck,[15] however, assume that the break-through took place in the exegesis of Psalm 30. For L. Pinomaa[16] and F. Huck[17] the

3 W. Link, *Das Ringen Luthers um die Freiheit der Theologie von der Philosophie,* 2nd ed. (München, 1955), 6-77, and G. Pfeiffer, "Das Ringen des jungen Luther um die Gerechtigkeit," in *Lutherjahrbuch, 26* (1959), 25 ff., discuss in great detail the Luther research on this question and analyze its results critically. Cf. also D. Löfgen, "Verschiedene Tendenzen in der neueren Lutherforschung," *Kerygma und Dogma,* 5 (1959), 163 ff.

4 *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* 2, i (Leipzig, 1912), 11 ff.

5 *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 4, i (Leipzig, 1933), 68 f., 70 f.

6 *Luther in Light of Recent Research,* translated by C. F. Huth (New York, 1916), 41 ff.

7 *Luther. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* I (Tübingen, 1932), 298, 299.

8 "Gesetz und Recht, Kirche und Obrigkeit in Luthers Lehre vor dem Thesenanschlag von 1517," in *Zeitsch. d. Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kononistische Abteilung,* 26 (1937), 285 ff.

9 "Die Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," in *Zeitschr. für Theologie und Kirche,* 48 (1951), 200 f., in spite of the statements on page 181.

10 *Die Taufe beim Jungen Luther* (Tübingen, 1954). Cf. review by E. Bizer in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* N.F., 67 (1955), 339 f.

11 *Die Anfänge von Luthers Christologie nach der ersten Psalmenvorlesung* (Berlin, 1929), 40 ff.

12 "Iustitia dei in der Scholastik und bei Luther," in *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte,* 39 (1942), 1 ff. Bornkamm's other contribution to this problem, "Luthers Bericht über seine Entdeckung der iustitia dei," in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 37 (1940), 117, has to be balanced with this.

13 *The Righteousness of God* (London, 1953), 123, 137.

14 "Initium theologiae Lutheri," in *Festgabe für Julius Kaftan,* 1920, 150 ff.

15 "Luther's Early Exegesis," in *Luther Today.* Martin Luther Lectures, I (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1957).

16 *Der existenzielle Charakter der Theologie Luthers,* Annales academiae scientiarium Fennicae, 1940.

17 "Die Entwicklung der Christologie Luthers von der Psalmen- zur Römerbriefvorlesung," in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.,* 102 (1930), 61 ff.

Reformation theology developed between the end of the first lectures on the Psalms and those on Hebrews. E. Bizer[18] and G. Pfeiffer[19] have placed the critical turning point between 1517 and 1519.

All these presentations more or less omit a positive evaluation of the theological tradition which was alive in the Roman Church. This is caused by the presuppositions of the authors. Justification by faith is considered to be the organizing principle of the young Luther's theology and the critical standard for the examination of the sources. From the very beginning, therefore, one concentrated only on those statements of Luther which were somehow related to this principle. As a result, all that is suggestive of traditional thought is neglected. If tradition is considered at all, it is seen only in the light of justification by faith. The questions asked are: How did Luther change tradition? Where and how did he depart from the thought of Augustine, Bernard, and scholasticism? Tradition is perhaps important in the terminology, but the material expressed in this terminology is definitely no longer traditional.[20] The young Luther is in principle identical with the mature Reformer, and both have regained access to the biblical kerygma.

Over against this interpretation is another extreme understanding of the young Luther which we find in C. Stange,[21] A. W. Hunzinger,[22] A. Hamel,[23] K. Bauer,[24] and partially also in E. Seeberg.[25] Here Luther's theology of the period before 1518 is interpreted only in terms of the theological and philosophical tradition.

In recent years the focus has been shifted from the criterion of justification by faith to that of Luther's hermeneutics.[26] The attempt was made to explain the theology of the young Luther on the basis of his christological and tropological understanding of Scripture. In the

18 *Fides ex auditu* (Neukirchen, 1958). Cf. review by T. Tappert in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 50 (1959), 106.

19 Cf. *op. cit.*

20 So E. Vogelsang, *op. cit.,* 9, footnote 2.

21 *Die Anfänge der Theologie Luthers* (Berlin, 1957).

22 *Luther Studien, I: Luthers Neuplatonismus in der Ersten Psalmenvorlesung 1513-1516* (Leipzig, 1906).

23 *Der junge Luther und Augustin,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh, 1934, 1935).

24 *Die Wittenberger Universitätstheologie und die Anfänge der deutschen Reformation* (Tübingen, 1928), 147 f.

25 *Luthers Theologie,* 2: *Christus, Wirklichkeit und Urbild* (Stuttgart, 1937).

26 Cf. G. Ebeling, *op. cit.,* and, by the same author, "Luthers Auslegung des 14. Psalms in der 1. Psalmenvorlesung im Vergleich mit der exegetischen Tradition," in *Zeitschr. für Theologie und Kirche,* 50 (1953), 280 f.

final analysis justification here also remained the dictating principle, since the christological interpretation of Scripture always calls for the existential, and both result in justification by faith as the motivation for Reformation theology.[27]

This understanding of the young Luther raises two problems. First, the traditional material which G. Ebeling has begun to present in overabundance, at least from the exegetical literature, and for which future students of the first lectures on the Psalms never can be sufficiently grateful, is analyzed under the aspect of justification by faith. This, however, does not do justice to Luther's theology during the time before, let us say, 1517 or 1518. Luther is judged on the basis of standards which he actually developed gradually and which were not yet completed at that period for which they are used as the critical principle. In addition, his theological origin is torn apart and is no longer seen as the unity which it has to be. The second problem is that under this dominance of justification by faith Luther's theology is, from its beginnings, taken away from vital connection with the Trinity and Christology and is reduced to religious existentialism.[28]

One final statement should be made. The emphasis on justification by faith gives no access to the young Luther's understanding of the sacraments. In spite of the large number of publications dealing with Luther in the period before 1520, there is none which is concerned in an intense, detailed fashion with the sacraments in general or with an individual sacrament, but for only two exceptions. In a concise article E. Bizer[29] dealt with Luther's discovery of the relation between Word and sacrament, while W. Jetter[30] analyzed Baptism.

II

So far as this writer can tell, Jetter has offered the only work on the young Luther's understanding of a sacrament. He investigated Luther's interpretation of Baptism from the time of the lectures on the Sentences to 1518 or 1519. This minutely detailed work is of great

27 Cf. W. Maurer, "Die Anfänge von Luthers Theologie. Eine Frage an die Lutherische Kirche," in *Theologische Literaturzeitung,* 77 (1952), 5 and footnote 2.

28 W. Maurer, *op. cit.,* 4 f. W. Maurer is, to the best of this writer's knowledge, the first to raise this serious criticism in regard to the method which is commonly used in Luther research.

29 "Die Entdeckung des Sakraments durch Luther," in *Evangelische Theologie,* 17 (1957), 64 ff.

30 *Op. cit.*

value since it is the first step into a field which is commonly bypassed. Yet serious objections arise in regard to the method with which Jetter approaches his material. He is a student of Ebeling and therefore handles his sources, especially the first lectures on the Psalms, from the standpoint of hermeneutics. The christological understanding of the Psalms demands the existential interpretation which Luther developed in the tropological exegesis. Christological and tropological understanding of Scripture results in justification by faith;[31] this is Jetter's criterion and organizing principle in his source analysis. He asks the question, Where and how did Luther first express a view of Baptism which is different from the previous theological tradition and which is shaped by his Reformation principle?[32] One cannot avoid the impression that according to Jetter this is already the case in the lectures on the Sentences. Luther is understood as a religious genius who, through his new hermeneutical principle, discovered a view of Baptism which is absolutely different from that of the Roman Church.

Jetter's presentation involves two serious consequences. (a) The source material on both the young Luther and the tradition, on which Jetter elaborates so profusely, is viewed in terms of justification by faith as the critical principle. The tradition is of value and is considered by Jetter only if it can be related negatively or positively to the new interpretation of Baptism; if not, it is neglected. The theology of Baptism which Jetter found in tradition has only a negative function; it serves to show how Luther differed from it. Jetter totally omitted the fact that Luther lived in this tradition, prayed in it, and suffered under it. Thus the significance of the theological and liturgical heritage of the church is ignored. (b) Jetter disregarded tradition or selected only what could be related to the young Luther, whom he saw under the aspect of justification by faith. The tradition of the church, especially of the early church, was shaped by the trinitarian and christological dogma which testified to God's revelation in Jesus Christ. This dogmatic heritage has to be the basic principle of Luther's theology since it originated in the divine revelation to which Luther was committed ex officio. Baptism would have to be seen first under the aspect of God's revelation and not under the aspect of justification by faith.

31 Cf. W. Maurer, *op. cit.*, 5, and footnote 2; W. Jetter, *op. cit.*, 254, 221, 293, 288, 280.
32 W. Jetter, *op. cit.*, vi, 109, 337.

In spite of good beginnings, Jetter overlooks this connection between revelation and Baptism. Therefore his view of Luther's theology, extremely stated, shrinks to religious existentialism. But Luther's theology was at all times trinitarian theology.[33] Trinitarian revelation was its organizing principle; justification by faith is—if this word may be used for sharp contrast—"only" the final consequence, if Christology is applied to man.

III

Let us now focus on the Lord's Supper. To the best knowledge of this writer there is no available work which deals exclusively and in detail with Luther's understanding of the Lord's Supper before 1516 or 1517. The period from 1517 to 1521 is touched upon in various smaller publications[34] which hardly match Jetter's work on Baptism. It is interesting, as has been observed,[35] that the sacramental theology of the young Luther stirred almost no interest at all. Even the latest English publication on Luther's eucharistic theology[36] omits the young Luther and concentrates on the eucharistic controversy. There are two probable reasons for this lack of interest:

a) In the controversy on the Lord's Supper, Luther was urged to return to the position which he held prior to 1523.[37] One must therefore conclude that Lutheran theologians are afraid of what they might find within the young Luther, especially since his eucharistic doctrine is already labeled as symbolism.[38]

b) The dominating position of justification by faith does not give any access to the young Luther's opinion on the Lord's Supper. It was in the controversy on the Mass that justification by faith was for the

33 Cf. *Grosser Katechismus* (1529), *WA* 30 I, 191, 28 ff.

34 J. A. Faulkner, "Luther and the Lord's Supper in the Critical Years 1517-1522," in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 1915, 202 f.; R. Prenter, "Luther on Word and Sacrament," in *More about Luther*. Martin Luther Lectures, III (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1958), 65 ff. See also the general presentations of Luther's theology and the literature on the eucharistic controversy which, usually as introduction, deals with the period from 1517 to 1521.

35 E. Bizer, "Entdeckung des Sakramentes . . . ," 64, 65.

36 H. Sasse, *This is my Body; Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959).

37 *Des hochgelerten Erasmi von Roterdam und Doctor Martin Luthers maynung vom Nachtmal vnseres herren Jhesu Christi newlich aussgangen auff den achtzehenden tag Aprellens im 1.5.2.6. Jar.* Cf. W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther*, I (Leipzig, 1924), 58, 137 ff., 179 f.

38 Cf. footnote 37 above, and E. Seeberg, *Luthers Theologie in ihren Grundzügen*, second ed. (Stuttgart, 1950), 154.

first time applied to the Lord's Supper. Before that struggle Luther did not see the sacrament under the aspect of this Reformation principle; consequently those statements of Luther on the Lord's Supper which were made prior to the time the sacrament became connected with justification by faith do not fit into any preconceived pattern. If the young Luther's theology would have been fitted into the background of the divine revelation in Jesus Christ, that is, into the background of the trinitarian and christological dogma of the early church which testifies to this revelation, then a deeper understanding of Luther's sacramental theology would have appeared in spite of the fact that the idea of justification by faith had not yet infiltrated the structure of his sacrament. E. Bizer[39] has shown convincingly how sacrament and revelation hang together in the sacramental character of the Word as manifestation of the trinitarian revelation.

The following are only preliminaries to the eucharistic theology of the young Luther with which this writer is engaged. For now we restrict ourselves to the first lectures on the Psalms. What are the main problems? What answers does a first glance at the sources and the secondary literature suggest? After considering the organization of the source material (IV), two major problems are discussed. What is the guiding principle of Luther's interpretation of the Lord's Supper? What does he understand by this sacrament? (V) And how is this basic interpretation related to tradition or surroundings? (VI) Is this understanding of the Lord's Supper "already" revolutionary in comparison with the theological heritage of the Roman Church in Luther's time?

IV

If we speak of the "young Luther," then it must be determined when this period in Luther's life ends. As historians we must search for historical dividing lines. The respite[40] which Luther had at the Wartburg brought the time of the young Luther to an end. His early theological development was then concluded. In his dramatic writings of 1520, the Roman Church was theologically overthrown; the last pos-

39 "Entdeckung des Sakramentes."

40 Cf. V. Vaijta, ed., *Lutherforschung heute. Erster Internationaler Kongress für Lutherforschung* (Berlin, 1958), 19.

sibilities for compromise were shattered. Erasmus, who had hoped for a peaceful settlement, began to withdraw. Luther was on his own. The man who returned from the Wartburg was different from the man who had been exiled there. The sensitive and conscientious young professor, who was at the same time rebellious and courageous, went to Worms and the Wartburg; the reformer of the church returned from the Wartburg to face the problem of rebuilding the church which had excommunicated him. The academic work in which Luther was involved offers natural and apparent subdivisions. Luther's study of Augustine and Peter Lombard, his great lectures on the Psalms, Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, the period of the great sermons written between 1518 and 1520, the second lectures on the Psalms and the great Reformation Writings of 1520 are convenient dividing lines for organization of the material. Thus a sacramental theology of the young Luther has to embrace the period from 1509 to 1521 or 1522. The assumption that the "young Luther" ended with the time he spent at the Wartburg is confirmed by another fact: Luther's view on the Lord's Supper was questioned by his own friends for the first time in 1521 and 1522. The kerygmatic meaning of the Lord's Supper was established in opposition to Rome and had now to be defended against heresies among his own followers. Truly, the Wartburg days began a new period in the *history* of Luther's understanding of the Lord's Supper. It must be established more firmly than it has in the past whether this also means a new period in the *theology* of the Lord's Supper.[41]

A word should be added in regard to the source material itself. The Weimar edition of Luther's works makes the necessary documents available. The first lectures on the Psalms, however, may be used only with the utmost care. The weaknesses in the modern edition of these lectures have been discussed over and over again.[42] It is too easy to blame the editor of Volumes 3 and 4 of the Weimar edition of Luther's works for having done unsatisfactory work. The commission which presently is at work on a new edition of these two volumes makes it only too obvious that this task is far beyond the physical power

41 Cf. W. Köhler, *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des Christlichen Selbstbewusstseins* (Zürich, 1951), 315 f. W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther,* I (Leipzig, 1924), 58 f., 70 ff., 179 ff.

42 Cf. H. Rückert, "Die Weimarer Lutherausgabe: Stand, Aufgaben, Probleme," in *Lutherforschung heute,* 113 f.

of one man. The new edition will enable exact differentiation between Luther's own thought and the traditional material which he worked into his lecture notes. Thus Luther may be observed working critically and evaluating the tradition. It will take quite some time, however, until this replacement edition will be available. Therefore one has either to break off all new attempts to learn Luther's thought from 1513 to 1515 or to make extraordinarily careful use of the current edition.

V

The eucharistic theology of Luther in the first lectures on the Psalms should be seen on the background of the theological tradition and the piety in which Luther was brought up, in which he lived, and with which he worked.[43] One cannot take justification by faith as the organizing principle for source analysis.[44] One cannot eliminate material which is not in agreement with the Lord's Supper as seen under justification by faith and label it as Roman Catholic, traditional, and therefore somehow unimportant for Luther's understanding. The source material concerning the young Luther's thought is a totality and has to be used as such.[45] Luther's interpretation of the Lord's Supper has to be developed within the rich heritage of his church, whether justification by faith agrees with individual passages or not.

Two centers of the heritage of the church were known to Luther. The one was scholastic and the other was patristic—especially, of course, Augustine. O. Scheel[46] has definitely established Luther's relationship to scholasticism. Luther differed from the schoolmen in going back to the theology of the ancient church.

43 J. Pelikan, "Luther and the Liturgy," in *More about Luther*. Martin Luther Lectures, I (Decorah, Iowa, 1958), 3 ff., is to my knowledge the first analysis *from a systematic viewpoint* of Luther's relationship to traditional piety and liturgy.

44 W. Maurer, *op. cit.*, 4. Maurer's work is distinguished by an effort to relate the theology of the young Luther to the early church. The crossroads where the young Luther and the theology of the early church meet is revelation in its concrete, sacramental form, or, as the early church phrased it, the mystery of Christ. Cf. *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* (Göttingen, 1948), 134, 114, 50, and the same author's *Bekenntnis und Sakrament*, I (Berlin, 1939).

45 W. Maurer, "Anfänge von Luthers Theologie," 5.

46 *Martin Luther, II: Im Kloster* (Tübingen, 1917).

A separate question, which in spite of some groundwork[47] has not yet been investigated, is, What were the detailed sources for Luther's patristic knowledge? Was it only Augustine? Or did he find a new and deeper insight into the dogmatic decisions on the Trinity and on Christology? Or was he aware of the religious realities confessed in the Creed in a new and different way than the schoolmen were? What vital sense for the trinitarian and christological mystery was preserved in the liturgy and in prayers?[48] How much non-scholastic theology of the Church Fathers was preserved in the exegetical literature of the Middle Ages?[49]

Luther turned from scholasticism to the theology of the ancient church. He could appreciate Peter Lombard, who avoided a philosophical substantiation of theology and wanted only to collect and organize statements of the Fathers.[50] The theology formed by the first three centuries of the church, which more or less successfully shaped theology from Augustine to Peter Lombard, was concerned with the Trinity and with Christology.[51] The ancient dogmatic statements expressed the divine mystery of which the world has perceived only a glimpse in the face of Jesus Christ. O. Casel and the Benedictines at Maria Laach[52] have claimed that in the ancient church the Eucharist was definitely an integral part of the mystery of the divine revelation, that revelation in Jesus Christ and sacrament were coordinated, and that the world, historically removed from the christological event, could not partake in the divine revelation if it did not have the sacraments.

47 Cf. J. Koopmans, *Het oudkerkelijk dogma in de reformatie, bepaaldelijk bij Calvijn* (Wageningen, 1938). E. Wolf, "Asterisci und Obelisci zum Thema: Athanasius und Luther," in *Evangelische Theologie,* 18 (1958), 481 f. E. Schäfer, *Luther als Kirchenhistoriker* (Gütersloh, 1897).

48 Here we depend totally on work which still has to be done in the field of Liturgics. The devotional and liturgical literature of the Middle Ages is still unexplored. It seems that all attempts in this field, at least among Protestant scholars, have not got off the ground. Roman Catholic interests are restricted to the Mass. F. X. Haimerl, *Mittelalterliche Frömmigkeit im Spiegel der Gebetbuchliteratur Süddeutschlands* (München, 1952), seems to be the single exception. One major problem is that the texts are still buried, to a great extent, in the manuscript treasures of libraries.

49 The new edition of the first lectures on the Psalms will here provide us with the necessary material, thanks to the painstaking work of G. Ebeling.

50 O. Scheel, *Dokumente zu Luthers Entwicklung bis 1519* (Tübingen, 1929), Nos. 219, 221, 222.

51 Cf. W. Maurer, "Anfänge von Luthers Theologie," 6.

52 *Mysterium: Gesammelte Arbeiten Laacher Mönche,* 1926; "Mysteriengegenwart," in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, 1928,* 145 f.; "Glaube, Gnosis und Mysterium," in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, 1935.*

This is the background for Luther's understanding of the Lord's Supper when he lectured for the first time on the Psalms. He concentrated on the trinitarian God who had revealed himself in the Incarnation. This is God's mystery, a miracle, a paradox, totally inconceivable by man.[53]

The mystery of the Incarnation, this divine revelation in Jesus Christ, is for Luther sacrament.[54] It is the event of salvation: it is God's miraculous deed which is presently effective in the church. The church confesses it in its dogma; the church preaches it in the Word; the church possesses it as reality in the sacraments.[55] Word and sacrament are therefore the two means by which the individual can participate in the divine revelation.[56]

The Lord's Supper is a sacrament of the church and as such manifestation of the mystery of the Incarnation. Like the Incarnation, the Lord's Supper, too, is God's mystery. It is the dwelling place of the trinitarian God in that realm which is opposite to God, namely, this world.[57] God is always present there, always effective, yet always withdrawn from man's intellect, hidden in mystery, accessible only through faith.[58] The Lord's Supper manifests God in Jesus Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit.

This view of the Lord's Supper has to be unfolded and traced in its theological details. For the present we shall restrict ourselves to (a) the real presence and (b) the *res sacramenti.*

a) E. Seeberg[59] has stated without further elaboration that the young Luther's understanding of the real presence is symbolic. One cannot agree with this statement and the way in which it is established. God reveals himself in the Lord's Supper in the most hidden way,[60] just as he did in the Incarnation. This means that Incarnation and Supper are coordinated. They both reveal God. Therefore *Christ* has

53 *WA* 3, 621. 2 f., 21 f.; 38. 4-14; 368. 22 ff.; 4, 236. 17 f. W. Maurer, *Von der Freiheit,* 54, 50, footnote 1. Luther here used the language and thought of the ancient church in order to express his concern; this becomes quite clear when one compares *WA* 3, 125, 1-9 with Athanasius, *De incarnatione verbi,* III (Migne, *Patr. Ser. Lat.* 3, 192).

54 *WA* 4, 118. 19-31; 83. 6-22; 3, 434. 23-26. Cf. W. Jetter, *op. cit.,* 178.

55 *WA* 4, 208. 22 f.; 229. 36 f.; 3, 104. 27-31; 89. 34-42.

56 W. Maurer, *Von der Freiheit,* 51, and footnote 1; 135 f. *WA* 3, 463. 24 ff.; 4, 183. 18 ff.

57 W. Maurer, *Von der Freiheit,* 154. *WA* 3, 621. 22.

58 *WA* 3, 124. 33 ff.; 4, 236. 17-23, 29-30; 243. 15-16; 471. 1 ff.; 3, 104. 27-105, 3; 4, 119. 28-31; 120. 1-4.

59 Cf. footnote 38.

60 *WA* 3, 124. 37.

to be *present* in the Supper as God's revelation, as truly as the mystery of the Incarnation was God's revelation in Jesus Christ. Luther even went so far as to say that Christ is offered together with the elements as food.[61] The real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is the undiscussed basis for Luther's opinion on the Lord's Supper. This is the only explanation for the silence of the first lectures on the Psalms in regard to the real presence.

Many questions arise here. How is this real presence to be understood? How is it related to the great controversy with Zwingli? How is it to be connected with the elements? In any case, the answer must be given from the background of the revelation-character of Luther's theology; it has to be measured by the standards of the trinitarian and christological dogma of the church.

b) Luther saw the *res sacramenti* as unity between Christ and the sinner. The high-priestly sacrifice of Christ is the center of the sacrament. Through the Lord's Supper we partake of this sacrifice by which all our sin is removed.[62] Luther expressed this in the picture of the heavenly feast, of which the individual on earth receives a taste through the Lord's Supper.[63] He also identified the *res sacramenti* with the mystical body of Christ, of which the individual becomes a member by his spiritual participation in the Lord's Supper.[64] Once again it becomes obvious that Luther sees the *res sacramenti* against the background of divine revelation. The sacrament sets forth God's revelation in the work of Jesus Christ. It enables us to be involved in this work and thus be cleansed from our sin and made the children of God.

VI

One more problem should be touched upon: Is the understanding of the Lord's Supper as developed by Luther in the first lectures on the Psalms unique if compared with that of the Roman Church? There is no clear answer. We have, however, two approaches to a solution:

a) Luther's interpretation of the Lord's Supper is contrary to that

61 *WA* 4, 243. 18 f.
62 *WA* 4, 243. 15 f.
63 *WA* 3, 469. 1-14; 140. 5-7; 4, 380. 35; 609. 14 f.
64 *WA* 4, 234. 35 ff.; 3, 38. 37-39; 4, 401. 1-18. In this connection there appears for the first time the picture of the marriage between Christ and the prostitute in which all that belongs to the marriage partners is exchanged: Christ takes her sin and she receives his goodness: *WA* 4, 130. 36 ff.

scholasticism. His ideas cannot be matched by those of Occam or Biel, ›th of whom he had studied.[65] They must have dissatisfied him, espe-ally in view of his own experience. Since the celebration of his first ass,[66] Luther realized that the Lord's Supper was more than the ›inions of the schoolmen expressed on this subject. He knew the ›rd's Supper as a mystery; it was the place where the young priest as confronted with his God. Therefore the sacrament could only be lored as divine mystery, not analyzed and defined as was done by the :holastics. As a result Luther ignored scholastic speculations about e Lord's Supper. His concern was directed to God's revelation in sus Christ, to that mystery which cannot be rationally explained and which one can partake only by faith.

As previously mentioned, it is an open question which sources in-ienced Luther. But of equal importance is the following problem: id Luther stand alone with this interpretation of the Lord's Supper is it also found, possibly in a different form, in the theology of the hristian humanists, or in the exegetical literature of the Middle Ages, ı in the piety of the later Middle Ages in its many orthodox or heret-al forms?[67] Finally one must ask whether and in what way Luther's imary or indirect sources, and possibly the sacramental theology and ety of his environment, affirmed or jeopardized the kerygmatic center the trinitarian and christological basis of Luther's theology.

b) Luther's theology of the Lord's Supper was different from at of scholasticism, but was it already in *absolute conflict* with that the Roman Church of his time? Was this already the doctrine which uther defended in his controversy with Zwingli?

65 Cf. *WA* 6, 195. 4; 30 II, 300. *Tischreden* 3, No. 3722. Cf. O. Scheel, *Martin Luther, II: Vom Kloster* (Tübingen, 1917), 34 ff.

66 *WA* Tischreden 2, No. 1558; 3, No. 3556. For a detailed discussion of this important ent, cf. R. H. Bainton, "Probleme der Lutherbiographie," in *Lutherforschung heute,* 29; H. Bainton, *Here I Stand, A Life of Martin Luther,* 27 ff.; J. v. Rohr, *A Study of the ıfechtung of Martin Luther* (Ph.D. Diss., Yale University, 1947), 141 ff., 197 ff.

67 The only available study of the theology and piety of the sacraments in the later Middle ges is restricted to the Hussite movement: E. Peschke, *Die Theologie der böhmischen Brüder ihrer Frühzeit,* I: *Das Abendmahl* (Stuttgart, 1935). Besides this we have such smaller ntributions as K. Boeckl, *Die Eucharistielehre der deutschen Mystiker* (Freiburg, 1924), d this writer's dissertation, *Die Abendmahlslehre des Erasmus von Rotterdam und seine Stel-ıg am Anfang des Abendmahlsstreites der Reformatoren* (Theol. Diss., Erlangen, 1955), but standard work is missing. This can only be deplored, since in this late medieval piety and the-›gy originate the problems over which the Reformers fought in the great eucharistic con-›versy.

To begin with, the answer has to be yes, notwithstanding that Luther has apparently not yet aligned justification by faith with the Lord's Supper. The fact that Luther preserved the sacrament as divine mystery, and took it out of all the scholastic speculation on the essence of the sacrament, established the absolute character of the divine revelation with regard to the kerygmatic center of the Lord's Supper.[68] This was lost both in the theories of the schoolmen and in the practice of the Roman Church. In his first lectures on the Psalms Luther would, however, also have rejected the symbolic interpretation of Zwingli had he been confronted by it, even though he had not yet clearly formulated and defined this point.

Nevertheless, Luther's opinion on the Lord's Supper was not yet *revolutionary* if compared with the church of his time. The relationship between the sacrament and the individual was, in the first lectures on the Psalms, not yet completely shaped by the impact of the kerygma, even as the doctrine of justification by faith was not yet completely developed. This can be seen in Luther's understanding of faith.[69] It was, on the one hand, a gift of God by which the individual is overpowered and drawn into the mystery of the divine revelation.[70] On the other hand, faith was imitation of Christ which conditions men to receive salvation,[71] and this idea was still in agreement with Roman Catholic theology and piety. This ambiguity in the conception of faith was due to the fact that Luther had not yet absolutely accepted Word and sacrament as the efficacious manifestation of the divine revelation;[72] he had not yet radically enough applied the kerygma, as critical principle, to the heritage of the church and drawn the necessary conclusions.

Here is the point at which future development of Luther's theology of the Lord's Supper must begin. Just as, in the understanding of justification by faith, the radical consequences were drawn from the trinitarian and christological dogmas of the ancient church and absolutely

68 Cf. the excellent work by E. Iserloh: *Gnade und Eucharistie in der philosophischen Theologie des Wilhelm von Ockham* (Wiesbaden, 1956). (Review by this writer in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 48 (1957), 257-261).

69 For a general orientation, cf. H. Adam, "Die Anschauung Luthers vom Glauben in der Ersten Psalmenvorlesung 1513-1516," in *Mitteilungen der Luthergesellschaft,* 1930, and E. Bizer, *Fides ex auditu,* 15 ff.

70 *WA* 4, 266. 27 f.; 3, 649. 17 f.; 4, 95. 2 f.; 3, 227. 28 f.; 627. 5 f.

71 Cf. G. Rupp, *op. cit.,* 149.

72 Cf. E. Bizer, "Entdeckung des Sakramentes."

pplied to anthropology, so also in the understanding of the Lord's Supper as testament (Lectures on Hebrews), with the accompanying rejection of the theory of the Mass, the theology of the sacrament was set by Luther into the trinitarian starting point. Thus the parts of the theological heritage of the church which jeopardized the kerygma were eliminated.

VII

We have attempted to show the problems which the Lord's Supper raises in the total frame of the young Luther's theology. In trying to give some answers we have established three points:

a) The importance of the theological and liturgical heritage of the church in which Luther was educated, lived, and worked is assured. Luther did not shape his Reformation theology as a result of a great discovery, or through some enlightenment. By prayer and study he developed his views from the materials available to him. These were the Scriptures, the theology of the ancient church (especially its dogmatic decisions), and scholasticism. Critically he examined the tradition on the basis of the divine revelation in Jesus Christ to which the dogmas of the ancient church testified.

b) We have tried not to minimize the importance of the sacraments of the church, especially the Lord's Supper. They are to be seen against the background of the trinitarian and christological dogmas as testimony to the revelation.

c) Luther's theology of the sacrament in the first lectures on the Psalms was formed by his constant awareness of the reality of the divine revelation; at that point, however, the Reformer had not yet critically enough applied the consequences of the revelation to anthropology. Therefore there are thoughts in Luther's theology of the Lord's Supper which, to a certain extent, jeopardize his kerygmatic starting point. In the future development of his understanding of the Lord's Supper as testament, in his rejection of the Mass, and in his defense of the real presence, the biblical understanding of the Lord's Supper is re-established.

Recent Linguistic Transition in Lutheranism

By David L. Scheidt

FROM its very beginnings until recent years one of North American[1] Lutheranism's major problems was that of language. Lutheran immigrants spoke the languages of the European continent. At first the Lutheran tongues in the New World were Swedish, Dutch, and German. Today Lutheranism in North America employs fifteen languages besides the dominant English in its proclamation of the Gospel and administration of the sacraments.

The language problem has not been exclusively peculiar to Lutheranism. Other denominations, including the Roman Catholic Church and the several Reformed and Eastern Orthodox bodies, have had to live and struggle with it. But none of these bodies has felt it so long or so acutely as have the Lutherans.

Muhlenberg regarded the language problem as nothing less than critical in his time. When the Swedish Provost Wrangel solicited the patriarch's opinion regarding the introduction of the English language in Swedish churches in Delaware, he replied: "Our entire Lutheran Church finds herself at the present facing a crisis. . . . She will either fall to laughing heirs because of her language and be devoured by strange parties, or she will rise from the dust, unfold herself, and encourage others besides her children to enjoy the good beneath her vine-plant, i.e., if the English language will not be forbidden."[2]

For Muhlenberg the introduction of the English language into the life and worship of the church did not mean the abolition of the mother tongue. For him the introduction of English was a necessity occasioned by intermarriage. The English language was a tool of evangelism, just as the German was a tool of preservation. Neither language had any kind of prior claim upon him when it came to the work of the church. During his stay in New York he had mastered

1 Reference is made throughout to *North American* Lutheranism in order to recognize the organizational unity of American and Canadian congregations in general bodies.

2 *Muhlenberg's Opinion on the Introduction of English in the Swedish Churches, 1761*, translated by Heinrich P. Suhr, in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. XIII, p. 85.

Dutch in order to make his ministry more effective. His views on language were set forth clearly in his letter to Wrangel: "We should look at language as we look at a bridge over a river. Whether it is made of oak or kanuo is not important so long as it holds and enables us to get across and toward our goal."[3]

The language problem, compounded by the multiplicity of languages used, often to the neglect or total disregard of English, has affected North American Lutheranism in three major ways.

First, the language problem has isolated Lutherans from one another behind curtains of language and national traditions. By the same token, language isolated Lutheran bodies from the main streams of Protestant life and thought, a situation which has marked Lutheranism as something foreign.

Second, the language problem has had an effect upon the numerical strength of Lutheranism in North America. The losses of second and third generations of immigrant families, and of unabsorbed immigrants to English-speaking bodies in the case of the former, or to the ranks of the unchurched are a matter of record. Just how many were lost to the Lutheran Church will never be known with certainty. Only succeeding waves of immigration and steady inroads by the English language preserved the church numerically. Nor do such losses because of language belong only to the distant past. Walter J. Kukkonen has pointed out that the Suomi Synod's dependence on Finnish immigration and failure to inaugurate English work caused losses to that body in recent years, especially during the 1930's.[4]

Third, the language problem has asserted itself in the struggle to preserve the confessional identity of Lutheranism. Unionistic leanings toward Episcopalianism can be regarded as an extreme of anglicizing tendencies. Similar leanings toward the German Reformed Church were an earlier identification of religious confession with nationality and language. Traces of the language problem can also be found in the controversy over "American Lutheranism." The study and translation of the Confessions occasioned by this issue dispelled the myth, cherished by many who resisted the English language, that the Lutheran faith was so inseparably bound to a European mother tongue

3 *Ibid.*, p. 82.

4 Walter J. Kukkonen, "The Suomi Synod's Stream of Living Tradition," in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, X (1958), p. 30.

that it could not be expressed in English without serious loss and adulteration.

By 1914 the language problem was still acute. The use of foreign languages, especially the German language, made the loyalty of Lutherans suspect in troubled and unstable times. In that year G. H. Gerberding complained: "We like to boast . . . that the Gospel is preached in Lutheran pulpits in more languages than were heard on the day of Pentecost. . . . But while these many tongues are on the one hand our glory, they are on the other hand our heavy cross."[5]

The era of World War I marked the major turning point. Many congregations dropped their mother tongue as an expression of patriotism and never returned to its use thereafter. In the years since, the language problem has been resolving itself so rapidly that any mention of it in our day suggests the exhumation of a cadaver long since buried and forgotten. During these years a steady and pronounced linguistic transition has been under way which heralds the day of linguistic uniformity for North American Lutheranism.

This transition can be demonstrated in several particulars. The first of these is the number of and attendance at non-English services in the several Lutheran bodies.

In 1937 the American Lutheran Church reported 41,929 services in the German language and 77,657 in English. By 1955 there were 9,138 German services and 134,733 in English. This is the last year for which such statistics are available for that body. The Lutheran Free Church reported 70 Norwegian services for 1952. Except for very occasional services of unique nature that language has disappeared from L.F.C. congregations. In the United Evangelical Lutheran Church 825 Danish services were conducted in 1945 and 9,175 in English. By 1958 the number of Danish services had dropped to 208. A similar decline is evidenced in the American Evangelical Lutheran Church which in 1939 reported 1,683 Danish services and 1,717 English whereas the statistics for 1958 show 269 Danish and 4,444 English services. Attendance at Finnish language services in Suomi Synod congregations totaled 4,031 in 1959, accounting for approximately one third of the total attendance.

5 G. H. Gerberding, *Problems and Possibilities: Serious Considerations for All Lutherans* (Columbia, S. C., 1914), p. 171.

The field of linguistic publications is a second particular in which he linguistic transition can be demonstrated.

In 1943 the United Lutheran Church in America discontinued publication of its German organ, *Der Lutherische Herold*. The following ear a group of German pastors in the Philadelphia area inaugurated ublication of the *Kirchliches Monatsblatt*. At the outset this underaking was without official support or sanction. Some years later the J.L.C.A.'s Committee on German Interests assumed sponsorship of he periodical, although the affairs of the paper are directed by a self-erpetuating publication committee. The paper receives an annual subidy from the U.L.C.A., but it has no official status. Its future in the ontemplated Lutheran Church in America is uncertain. The *Monatsblatt* has a fair number of subscribers in Germany and among the iaspora Germans in South America. Its circulation of 2,600 in 1960 s roughly 1,000 more than that of the *Herold* in its last year of publiation. Letters from readers, which are often published in the *Monatsblatt,* indicate that many are quite elderly.

The *Luthersk Ugeblad,* Danish organ of the U.E.L.C., declined n circulation from 2,160 in 1944 to 893 in 1958. In the same year the .E.L.C.'s *Kirke og Folk* had declined to 700. Both papers will cease ublication in 1961 when The American Lutheran Church begins peration. The same is true of the A.L.C.'s *Kirchenblatt,* which at the eginning of 1960 had a circulation of 2,642.

The most recently available statistics show a circulation of 11,281 or the Missouri Synod's German organ, *Der Lutheraner,* as compared ith 24,000 in 1947. The Evangelical Lutheran Church discontinued s Norwegian language children's paper in 1943 and its official Norvegian organ in 1956.

A third particular in which the transition can be demonstrated is he role and influence of the linguistic constituencies in the official gencies of the several bodies. This is particularly evident in the Jnited Lutheran Church in America.

Since its organization in 1918, the U.L.C.A. has come to embrace multiplicity of linguistic groups. This makes it a kind of microcosm f North American Lutheranism. In line with the statement on linuistic policy embodied in the Washington Declaration of 1920, the ivision of Linguistic Missions of the Board of American Missions

organized and oversaw work among post-war Finnish, Hungarian, and German immigrants. It also sponsored Slovak, Icelandic, Spanish, and Italian mission work in several cities.

This division was discontinued in 1948, when its long-time and only secretary, Ernst August Tappert, retired. In his final report to the convention of the church Dr. Tappert reviewed the work of his division over the years. He declared that the linguistically transitional status of post-World War I congregations organized or aided by the Division of Linguistic Missions and the apathy toward the church on the part of post-World War II immigrants no longer warranted continuation of the Division. The Board's work among linguistic groups is now chiefly limited to Canada and is of bilingual rather than unilingual nature.

In 1920 the U.L.C.A.'s standing Committee on Linguistic Interests became the Committee on German Interests. The purpose of this committee has been to act in a consultative and intercessory capacity to all boards and agencies of the church in matters touching upon the German-speaking membership of the church.

Over the years this committee's reports to the convention of the church show preoccupation with the necessity of providing for a native-born, bilingual ministry and the publication of ministerial acts in the German language for the use of the pastors of bilingual congregations and for pastors whose reading knowledge of the German language would enable them to perform these acts for their German-speaking parishioners. In 1960 the Muhlenberg Press published the *Evangelisches Liederbuch*, a small volume containing liturgy, Scripture passages, and shortened texts of the more familiar German hymns and religious folk-songs. Published under the auspices of the Committee on German Interests, this volume is intended to replace the *Kirchenbuch,* which has been out of print for a number of years. It is hardly likely that there will ever be a publication of the occasional services in the German language.

In 1954, the U.L.C.A.'s Commission on Structure recommended that this committee be abolished. Largely influenced by the persuasive speech of a member of the committee, the convention defeated the recommendation. There is no provision for such a committee in the proposed constitution of the Lutheran Church in America.

With the permission of the church's Executive Board, this committee has sponsored the biennial General German Conference, an assembly of pastors and laymen which acts as a forum for the discussion of problems and labors shared mutually by German and German-English congregations. The most recent conference was held in Philadelphia in 1959 in connection with a German preaching mission conducted by Bishop Hanns Lilje under the sponsorship of a local congregation. Attendance at this conference was very small and drew chiefly from the Philadelphia-New York area.

Although there is no corresponding committee to act in behalf of the U.L.C.A.'s other linguistic groups, the Finns and Hungarians also hold general conferences. The Slovaks and Icelanders have their own synods and synodical language publications. The Hungarian Conference publishes a small periodical, *Eros Var*. The Latvian and Estonian pastors and congregations have no such conference on the denominational level. They maintain their ties to one another and to pastors and congregations in other Lutheran bodies in North America in a fellowship rooted in their relationship to their respective native churches in exile.

In 1955 the German Conference of the Pittsburgh Synod petitioned the synod for dissolution on the ground that its numerical smallness did not justify continued existence. In 1958 a thorough revision of the organization of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania dissolved all of that synod's conferences, including the German Conference, which at that time consisted of fewer than a dozen congregations in the metropolitan Philadelphia area. Both synods appointed committees to look after the interests of bilingual congregations. The New York and New Jersey Synods have similar committees.

Dissociation from national origin through the changing of denominational name is a fourth particular which demonstrates linguistic transition.

In 1917 the Missouri Synod dropped the word German from its title chiefly because of war-time pressure. The German language, however, continued to be the official language of the synod for a good many years after. The United Danish Lutheran Church in America became the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1945. In 1948 the Scandinavian Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod became the Augustana

Evangelical Lutheran Church. The Danish Lutheran Church in America became the American Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1953. In 1958 the Slovak Synod became the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and in 1959 the Norwegian Synod became the Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

In 1918 the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America decided to drop Norwegian from its title and to take another name. At that time it was reported that many of that body's congregations were using English exclusively.[6] The year before the change an English Association had been organized under the leadership of Dr. C. O. Solberg to promote more extensive use of the English language in the church. The proposal to drop the word Norwegian was justified on the ground that "although this word [Norwegian] is historically appropriate, it is no longer actually correct, inasmuch as other nationalities are represented, and the English language is very largely used in its worship."[7] A satisfactory new name was not found until 1946 when this body became the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The only remnant of national origin remaining in the E.L.C. is the Norwegian Conference. The function of this conference has been to arrange exchange pastorates with the Church of Norway. It has also promoted the translation of Norwegian theological works. The conference recently made possible the publication of Bishop Skard's *The Incarnation,* translated by Herman E. Jorgensen, former editor of the church's Norwegian organ. The conference ceased to function January 1, 1961.

In the U.L.C.A. only the titles of the Icelandic and Slovak-Zion Synods indicate their national origin and linguistic character. Of the general bodies, only two, the Suomi Synod and the Finnish Apostolic Lutheran Church of America, suggest their national origin and linguistic character in their denominational titles.

The following charts demonstrate the progress of linguistic transition in the U.L.C.A. from 1940 to 1958 and in the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod from 1946 to 1959 in terms of the number of congregations in which languages other than English were used in public worship. In order to present a more accurate picture of the linguistic

6 *Lutheran Almanac, 1919* (Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House), p. 62.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 63.

omplexion of the Missouri Synod, only the linguistic congregations in English-speaking North America are included.

LANGUAGE CODE

G-	German	Li-	Lithuanian
Sl-	Slovak	Ic-	Icelandic
W-	Wendish	It-	Italian
H-	Hungarian	N-	Norwegian
Po-	Polish	Sw-	Swedish
D-	Danish	Sp-	Spanish
F-	Finnish	Es-	Estonian
La-	Latvian	C-	Chinese

U. L. C. A.

	G	*Sl*	*W*	*H*	*Po*	*D*	*F*	*La*	*Li*	*Ic*	*It*	*N*	*Sw*	*Es*	*Sp*	*Total*
940	415	36	—	12	—	—	12	—	—	46	2	2	—	—	1	526
941	417	42	1	13	—	—	13	—	—	48	2	—	—	—	1	537
942	369	41	2	12	—	—	15	1	—	46	3	—	—	—	1	490
943	331	43	1	13	—	—	10	1	—	18	2	—	—	—	1	420
944	321	46	2	13	—	—	10	1	—	20	3	—	—	—	1	417
945	379	40	1	11	—	—	12	—	—	20	1	—	—	—	1	465
946	315	42	3	14	—	—	11	2	—	38	2	—	—	—	1	428
947	312	42	2	14	—	—	10	1	—	41	2	—	—	—	1	425
948	303	45	2	12	—	—	7	2	—	42	1	—	—	—	1	415
949	278	45	2	12	—	—	11	3	—	36	2	—	—	—	1	390
950	253	47	2	10	—	—	8	10	—	31	2	—	—	—	3	366
951	269	53	2	11	—	—	12	14	—	22	3	1	—	1	16	404
952	267	53	2	12	—	—	14	20	—	31	1	1	—	7	16	424
953	259	47	2	11	1	—	12	23	1	27	1	—	—	9	17	410
954	253	46	2	12	1	—	14	18	—	25	1	—	—	8	13	393
955	245	50	2	12	1	—	11	17	—	26	1	—	1	9	19	394
956	242	52	2	12	1	—	11	18	—	14	1	—	1	8	16	378
957	226	50	2	11	1	—	10	19	—	15	1	—	—	8	16	359
958	221	53	2	11	1	—	10	23	—	9	1	1	2	8	21	363

MISSOURI SYNOD[9]

	G	*Sl*	*Po*	*Sp*	*La*	*Es*	*Li*	*C*	*It*	*F*	*Total*
946	1,561	3	3	15	3	1	1	1	—	3	1,591
947	1,157	4	6	10	3	1	1	1	1	2	1,186
948	1,058	2	13	8	6	1	1	1	1	—	1,091
949	1,014	2	6	12	4	2	1	1	1	—	1,043
950	974	4	6	13	6	4	2	1	1	—	1,011
951	915	4	8	12	8	8	2	1	1	—	959
952	921	2	5	13	13	13	2	1	—	—	970
953	832	2	8	10	10	12	2	1	—	—	877
954	788	2	7	14	18	17	2	1	—	—	849
955	701	2	7	13	18	14	3	1	—	—	759
956	636	3	8	11	14	16	3	1	—	—	692
957	569	5	4	11	17	12	3	1	—	—	622
958	513	2	7	11	18	12	3	1	—	—	567

It should be noted that the increase in U.L.C.A. congregations is

9 Cf. Paul T. Dietz, "The Transition from German to English in the Missouri Synod from 10-1947," in the *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly*, Vol. XXII, pp. 97-127. Dietz traces e language change in terms of districts and percentage.

due to the inclusion of a number of non-synodical congregations which have a relationship to the Slovak-Zion Synod through their pastors. It also demonstrates the diligence with which that synod has won independent congregations to synodical affiliation. Aversion to such affiliation, Ernst August Tappert pointed out in his last report as secretary of the Division of Linguistic Missions, had long been one of the major problems in Slovak work. The Spanish, Italian, and Chinese linguistic groups are a testimony to missionary efforts in the United States and Puerto Rico.

The chart below shows the linguistic complexion of North American Lutheran bodies as of 1958.

Body	*National Origin*	*Total Congs.*	*Ling. Congs.*
Eielsen	Norwegian	9	1
E.L.C.	Norwegian	2,630	5
Brethren	Norw.-Swedish	45	1
Free Church	Norwegian	243	0
Ev. Luth. Synod	Norwegian		no statistics
A.E.L.C.	Danish	79	20
U.E.L.C.	Danish	181	24
Apostolic	Finnish	59	59
Suomi Synod	Finnish	153	146
National	Finnish	66	51
Synod of Ev. Luth. Chs.	Slovak	55	54
Augustana	Swedish	1,235	0
A.L.C.	German	2,081	no statistics
U.L.C.A.	German	4,552	363
Mo. Synod	German	5,368	567
Wisconsin Synod	German	827	140

Of the five linguistic congregations in the E.L.C., two are Latvian.

By linguistic groups North American Lutheranism counts the following number of congregations:

German	928
Hungarian	11
Danish	44
Norwegian	6
Slovak	111
Latvian	41
Estonian	18
Wendish	2
Chinese	1
Spanish	33
Italian	1
Finnish	216
Polish	8
Lithuanian	2
Swedish	2

These totals do not include statistics for Norwegian congregations in the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, German congregations in the Amer-

:an Lutheran Church, or Latvian, Estonian, and other congregations ithout relationship to a synod.

The preceding chart shows that in those bodies which will con- ummate the 1960 merger forming The American Lutheran Church, ie first Lutheran merger to cross the lines of national origin and lin- uistic character, the language transition is virtually complete. This is ot the case in the proposed Lutheran Church in America.

The proposed constitution of the Lutheran Church in America rovides for "interest" conferences similar to those held by the Ger- ans, Finns, and Hungarians in the U.L.C.A. The Suomi Synod has greed to total merger, looking upon a Finnish Conference as its best eans of serving its Finnish-speaking membership. In a report on egotiations during 1958 Suomi President Raymond Wargelin said: In this status, the Finnish members of our church would find a omfortable and natural means of expression. . . . We realize that is can mean annual meetings, Bible camps, and even the maintenance f a Finnish language publication."[10] The Slovak-Zion Synod, however, eriously questions whether the synodical presidents would work with Slovak Conference in securing Slovak-speaking pastors for congre- ations which would need them.[11]

As to the factors which have been at work in the linguistic tran- tion of recent years, they are so obvious that little needs to be aid about them. Since before the turn of the century there has been sharp decline in immigration to North America from the Lutheran eas of Europe. The greatest spurts of immigration came after the vo world wars. That which followed the first war prolonged the lin- uistic character of many congregations and established a goodly num- er of new ones, especially in Canada. Post-World War II immigra- on, however, has not had the same effect. Along with the decline in nmigration as a factor in linguistic transition is the death-rate among der Lutheran immigrants.

The changing face of our cities and the disappearance of tra- tional nationality neighborhoods have also played a role in the ansition. Certain neighborhoods are no longer points to which im- igrants gravitate. This has made many linguistic urban churches rangers in their own neighborhoods, unable to reach, win, and inte-

10 *Yearbook of the Suomi Synod, 1958,* p. 151.
11 Cf. *The Lutheran,* July 13, 1960, p. 34.

grate any substantial number of new immigrants, and unable or unwilling to evangelize within the shadow of their steeples.

The major factor in linguistic transition has been the scarcity of ministers for linguistic churches. Both of the Slovak synods are feeling the pinch. Considerably less than half of their theological candidates have sufficient command of the language to the extent that they can conduct services and preach in Slovak. The Suomi Synod is also concerned about linguistic training for future pastors to meet the needs of Suomi's Finnish-speaking members.

From 1882 until 1930 a great many of the German pastors came from Kropp Seminary in Schleswig-Holstein. This seminary was specifically intended for the training of ministers for service among German immigrants in North America. Kropp had an official relationship with the General Council and the U.L.C.A. The latter relationship was terminated in 1930, when the seminary closed. In that year thirteen candidates for the ministry crossed the ocean to complete their training and to be ordained by North American synods.

In spite of the trickle of German-speaking pastors who came to these shores as DP's after the war, it has become increasingly difficult to fill German pulpits in the United States. This is not yet the case in Canada. Shortage of clerical personnel in Europe in general, and Germany in particular, not to mention the political circumstances which are relevant, makes it highly unlikely that pastors will be secured from abroad for linguistic congregations here. Within the past five years, however, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania has received two pastors under the call of linguistic congregations from German *Landeskirchen*.

How long will it be until the linguistic transition is complete and the uniform use of English achieved? One hesitates to venture a prediction. But in light of the factors at work in the transition, that day cannot be too far off.

Nor is it very important to know or to be able to predict when the transition will be completed. For all practical purposes the transition is as good as complete now. It is inconceivable that anything can or will arrest or reverse it.

There can be no doubt that the linguistic transition to English as the common medium of thought, expression, and communication has been the major single factor in unifying North American Lutheranism. The merger of the E.L.C., U.E.L.C., and the A.L.C. to constitute The

American Lutheran Church, and the proposed merger which will unite the A.E.L.C, the U.L.C.A., the Augustana Church, and the Suomi Synod in the Lutheran Church in America demonstrate not only the rumbling of the walls of national isolation but also the alignment of Lutheran bodies along lines of theological disposition and emphasis in organic unions rather than cooperative councils.

By the same token the linguistic transition has brought North American Lutheranism into shoulder-rubbing contact with other Protestants on virtually every level.

The transition has brought with it not only advantage and prestige but also problems. It is abundantly clear that there is for North American Lutheranism no longer a ready-made constituency which by virtue of language and nationality background is an exclusive reservoir for Lutheran growth. Theodore G. Tappert has pointed out that "... the future growth of the church will depend, apart from the natural increase among the children of church members, on aggressive evangelism among the unchurched half of our civil population."[12] The linguistic transition has emancipated North American Lutheranism from restricted confinement to its traditional circles of adherents to pursue this kind of evangelism. The appearance of such names as Davidson, Murray, Callahan, Esposito, Wioncek, and Jones on our parish registers, the extensive programs of home missions and urban renewal, and the heightened emphasis upon congregational evangelism give persuasive evidence that the church is attempting precisely this kind of evangelism. Nor is the appearance in increasing numbers of Negro Lutherans as a result of such evangelism particularly novel or shocking.

Hand in hand with such evangelism is a mammoth cultural adjustment with theological undercurrents. As the echoing voices of the homelands become more faint and inaudible both in language and tradition, the evolving of a distinctively native North American Lutheranism becomes more discernible. That this is desirable as well as inevitable is clear. The question is, will this distinctively native North American Lutheranism, in its cultural adjustment, become naturalized without being nationalized? Tappert has posed the question this way:

12 Theodore G. Tappert, *The Prospects of the Lutheran Church in America,* published by the German Conference of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1945), p. 5.

"Will the momentum of this cultural adjustment proceed so far as to erase the distinctions between Lutheranism and the rest of Protestantism? This has a bearing on the future growth of the Lutheran Church. For if the distinctions are erased, the unchurched will probably prefer other communions to the Lutheran inasmuch as the other communions are more deeply rooted in the American consciousness. The appeal of the Lutheran Church to non-Lutherans, experience seems already to have demonstrated in some areas, lies in the confessional position, the piety, the pastoral work, the catechization, the hymnody, and the worship which are distinctively Lutheran. To give these up will result in an extreme 'Americanization' of Lutheranism instead of a modest 'Lutheranization' of America. To give these up will mean that the Lutheran Church will cease to grow and eventually will begin to decline."[13]

The linguistic transition appears to be the prelude to the resumption of the American Lutheran controversy of a century ago.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Reform in Roman Catholicism

By Carl Umhau Wolf

THE very title of this article may sound to many either like a paradox or like an outright lie. But phrases used to describe the present state of Catholicism show that the title is allowable. We read of a "Christian Dilemma," of "American Catholic Crossroads," of an "American Catholic Dilemma," of "Frontiers in American Catholicism," etc. Protestant reaction to the Vatican Council and papal infallibility, as well as to the increased emphasis on Mary, with the possibility that the next Vatican Council may proclaim her co-redemptrix, almost rules out all hope of reform. "The possibility of the Church letting itself be told something [by the Word of God] is ruled out. . . . The further consequence is that the Church is, strictly speaking, irreformable."[1] On the other hand, T. Sartory notes, "Reform of the church always implies a renewal of her inner vitality. . . . Most effective reform in the Catholic Church has begun either from the periphery or from grass roots."[2]

Pope John XXIII is himself a conundrum. He has proved himself to be far from the interim pope some expected on his selection. His attitude toward liberalization of liturgy, toward separated Christians, toward Bible reading and the planned Roman ecumenical council has surprised even Catholics. Yet in other respects he continues or increases certain conservative practices. A new 300-day indulgence for family life was recently granted for any married man who kisses his wife's wedding ring and recites a short prayer. This is of course in the tradition of Pius XII, who offered special indulgences for Holy Year prayers and Holy Year pilgrimages. The explanation of indulgences has been reformed in some catechisms but remains quite objectional to Protestants in other places—e.g., "Indulgences are means to encourage the faithful to perform those good works which alone offer us

1 J. K. Reid, "The Bible and Modern Religions: Roman Catholicism and the Bible," in *Interpretation* XIII, 1 (January, 1959), pp. 71 ff.; cf. note in *CBQ* by R. Murphy, April, 1959, p. 197.
2 T. Sartory, "The Contemporary Ecumenical Movement," in *American Benedictine Review*, March, 1959, p. 16 f.

the possibility of acquiring personal merit and therefore of hoping more in the mercy of God."[3]

The Roman diocesan synod held on January 24, 1960, was thought to be a trial run for the ecumenical council. Since it was the first one called for hundreds of years, Pope John was seen to be reforming and progressive. However, some of the rules there laid down were narrow and exclusive. The American Catholic press emphasized that these rules were for the Roman diocese only, but others have suggested that they may become world-wide and even be presented to the next Vatican Council.

Priests are required by these rules to seek permission before buying or even driving an automobile. They cannot travel alone with a woman even if she is a close relative. Nuns are never to travel with a man. Yet, curiously, religious who drive should have modernized headgear to protect the driver. Laywomen cannot receive the sacraments with bare arms or while wearing slacks. The laity are to avoid all objectionable movies, stage plays, and television on pain of excommunication. Politicians are to enact no laws harmful to the church. No layman is to vote for political parties or persons promoting heretical doctrine or principles (this is not limited to communists). Laymen are forbidden to read Protestant literature or attend non-Catholic services or discussions.

Protestants will be surprised to hear many Roman voices which echo a shibboleth that sounds familiar: "Christian reform must be based on a return to the Bible. Without the Bible the liturgical movement will degenerate into medievalism."[4] Stronger yet: "The Catholic problem lies in what one may call the theological application of the Bible, the incorporation of the theology of the Bible in the systematic theology of the church."[5] This biblical interest and orientation is called "the most remarkable phenomenon in current Roman Catholic theology."[6] But it is not received with joy by many of the clergy, theologians or laity.

3 *Holy Year 1950,* pamphlet, p. 6.

4 C. Charlier, *The Christian Approach to the Bible* (1958) p. 291.

5 J. L. McKenzie, "Problem of Hermeneutics in Roman Catholic Exegesis," in *JBL,* September, 1958, pp. 197 ff.

6 NCW release, published by *Lutheran Standard,* December, 1959.

I

There is a human element here, a cultural and scholastic lag, an ntegration problem within the higher areas of Catholic scholarship, pecifically between theology and Scripture. This separation, which s due entirely to the rapid progress made recently in scriptural studies, vill in time be remedied. Theologians opposed some of the biblical tudies before 1943.[7] "The new look in exegesis causes consternation mong the faithful and clergy."[8] "Sometimes the new trends come as shock to the average layman."[9] This consternation does not deter the iblical scholar, who can be concerned in return. "One shudders to nink of the harm that is done in the name of Bible History. Most nanuals on Scripture ought to be burned."[10] "The task of the exegete s not done until he reaches with his results the wider public, clergy nd laity, and not just his fellow biblical scholars."[11] Obviously Bible tudents feel that some changes will be made in the formulations of neology, in catechisms, even in the order of Dogmatics. So McKenzie uggests that the doctrine of God and Messianism should not be first opic in Dogmatics.[12] And while manuals of theology are being re-ised, the most dramatic revision, some say, will need to be made in he treatment of eschatology.[13]

The 1956 presidential address to the Catholic Biblical Association y T. A. Collins[14] may be a sample of what is coming. It notes a num-er of current theological errors concerning Old Testament revelation nd Messianism. (1) The tendency to project the desired dogmatic roof into a passage under investigation, thereby giving it a sense ever intended by the sacred writer. (2) The hasty assumption of octrinal identity where only literary affinity exists. (3) Failure to nvestigate the various stages in which revelation of the Messiah un-olded, thus neglecting the order of divine providence. (4) Attributing

7 McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 198.
8 Eric May, "Problems of a Biblical Mariology," in *Marian Studies,* XI (1960), p. 58.
9 R. W. Gleason, "New Trends in Scriptural Interpretations," in *Catholic Mind,* July-August, 1960, p. 299.
10 Charlier, *op. cit.*, p. 292.
11 McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 203 f.
12 J. L. McKenzie, *The Two-Edged Sword,* pp. 5, 286 f.
13 E. Lussier, "The Biblical Theology on Purgatory," in *American Ecclesiastical Review,* April, 1960, p. 225.
14 T. A. Collins, in *CBQ,* 19 (1957), pp. 1 ff.

too much or too little to the literal sense. "Professors of Sacred Scripture find it difficult—nay, impossible—to keep silence when they discover messianic texts misinterpreted or misused, especially in manuals of apologetics and dogmatic theology. They insist that in many instances the texts referred to simply do not prove what they are alleged to prove. Professors of Dogmatic Theology rightly complain that they fail to receive from the biblical expert satisfactory substitutes (sic!) for those rejected texts alleged to be defective as dogmatic proofs." Students are even more bewildered when caught between two professors and their disciplines.

So the Roman Catholic use of proof texts is under attack. "The proof-text method is not so convincing as a synthetic portrayal of Old Testament Messianism in Christ."[15] Deplored is the "technique which seeks in Scripture for brief, isolated phrases suitable to serve as major or minor of a scholastic syllogism. . . . The very idea of 'proof' is a distortion; what Scripture offers is evidence, testimony given by living witnesses in their own words."[16]

The former editor of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* also objects to texts taken out of context. "Most exegetes question the use of certain passages as proof texts in dogmatics."[17] Many proofs formerly used are thus discarded, including Job 19:21 ff. for the resurrection or Gen. 3:15 and Isa. 7:14 for the virgin birth. Many proof texts on purgatory and eschatology, now quoted in apologetic works, are criticized.[18] So I Cor. 3:15 has nothing to do with purgatory. Isa. 14:3-21 is not a proof of hell's fire. The use of the Bible in the new German Catholic Catechism and its English translation is a beginning in the right direction. Incidentally, it provides an index to Scripture passages, and its advertisement includes, "A Catholic Catechism centered in the Bible and the Church." McKenzie says, "The use of the Bible as a mine of proof texts is dying in Catholic theology, and very few will regret it."[19]

A beginning is being made in the direction of a synthesis, although a complete system has not yet been erected. "Many of us feel that a theological synthesis of the Bible would be premature. We are, I think,

15 McKenzie, *Two-Edged Sword,* p. 9.
16 *Marian Studies,* 1960, p. 41.
17 May, *op. cit.,* p. 40.
18 Lussier, *op. cit.,* p. 227.
19 McKenzie, in *JBL,* p. 199.

search of a philosophy, rather than in possession."[20] Others think ie time is ripe to begin a synthesis since so much of the material back- round has been established.[21] An interesting example is that of a scholar ho built a creed from Scripture passages linked together and entitled it The Kerygma of Salvation."[22] It is a surprisingly evangelical credo.

Before moving on we should note the problem of senses and the elation of exegete to theologian. Is the exegete independent and distinct om the biblical theologian, and are both isolated from the dogma- cian? One opinion is that "biblical theology presupposes no philosophy save that of common sense), no rational scheme, no intellectual co- dinates; or rather, it adapts the Semitic and Hellenistic categories of ought which were those of the inspired authors; only it rethinks iem, decants the meaning of words, purifies concepts, and translates iem into a language which is eternally valid."[23] There is some hope iat biblical exegetes and biblical theologians can permeate philosophy id theology. Monsignor Whalen sums up the problem this way: "The eld continues to advance so swiftly and on such a wide front that even ecent textbooks are obsolete. There is no time for a synthesis. . . . Con- equently, it is at present most difficult to find in a Scripture manual ome definite and final conclusion on which to base Catholic teaching. . . The specific advice I have for you, as theologians and religious eachers, is first of all to be willing to adjust your previous ideas con- erning the Bible. . . . You cannot keep your biblical knowledge as a tatus quo. . . . Have confidence in the modern Scripture movement; be ealthily modern, be willing to learn."[24] This suggests the possibility f reform, and also that the disease of Ghetto defensiveness and dog- natism is waning.[25]

When the word "reform" is used in Roman Catholicism today it usually used with reference to the liturgical movement. Liturgical eform has been part and parcel of the work of the popes since World Var I and may be one of the major subjects of the Second Vatican ouncil. "Among all the influences and forces which are shaping the

20 McKenzie, "A Response," in *CBQ*, July, 1960, p. 315.
21 DeVaux, "A Propos de la Theologie Biblique," *ZAW* 68 (1956), p. 225 f.
22 M. Ramsauer, "The Kerygma of Salvation," in *Mission Bulletin*, April, 1959, p. 360; printed in *Theology Digest*, Spring, 1960, p. 122 f.
23 Quoted by May, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
24 Whalen, MS., "The Catholic Scripture Movement."
25 Thomas O'Dea, *American Catholic Dilemma* (1959), p. 125.

Roman Catholic Church today, no movement contains such promise of new life."[26]

Liturgical reform is not isolated or independent from the biblical scholarship of the last two decades. The Mass, of course, is largely an assemblage of biblical quotations, and the Missal contains prayers with many biblical phrases and allusions. Danielou studied the meaning of the Bible as presented and represented in the liturgy.[27] He here discussed the whole subject of biblical typology with special emphasis on that of the early Church Fathers (including some heretics). He writes, "Sacramental theology must be considered as essentially biblical. First, it is the authority justifying the existence and form of the sacraments, and second, it gives us the symbolism in which sacraments are to be first conceived."[28] The liturgy is to communicate the living Word. The vernacularists (see below) claim that Latin cannot do this. The liturgical movement involves fuller use of Scripture in the Mass, more instruction on the Bible in the sermon, perhaps even a new pericope system. "At the present time a very small fraction of the New Testament is embodied in Epistles and Gospels read on Sunday." If the new plan works out, the entire New Testament will be covered in either a three- or four-year cycle. This is to be favorably compared with the ancient Jewish system and with A. R. Kretzmann's plans for a new Anglican-Lutheran cycle of pericopes. The European leaders in the liturgical movement are deeply steeped in the Bible and are leaders in the biblical renaissance. In fact, even in America it has been the Catholic liturgical presses that have translated most of the good German and French biblical works.[29]

The liturgical movement began at the turn of the century in Europe, largely in monastic orders, with the Benedictines taking the lead then as now. I cannot go into the history of this movement but simply refer to the works of others.[30] The movement reached America in the 1920's, but it is really only since World War II that any real

26 E. B. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (1954), p. 1.

27 J. Danielou, *The Bible and Liturgy* (1956).

28 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

29 So at South Bend, Indiana, and Collegeville, Minnesota. The Benedictines in Collegeville have prepared a fine New Testament paper-back commentary series in eighteen volumes.

30 Cf. Koenker, *op. cit.* L. Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety,* which is given credit for really introducing the movement to the United States. D. Winzen, "Gueranger and the Liturgical Movement," in *American Benedictine Review,* VI, pp. 418 ff.

nterest has been stirred here. The reports of the North American Liturgical Conferences make interesting reading and reveal the manifold divisions of the movement. The first Liturgical Week in the United States was held in 1940, and from this developed the 1960 conference held in Pittsburgh August 22-25, attracting almost 6,000 persons.[31]

In addition to the biblical emphasis, the two major trends in the liturgical movement are agitation for vernacular Bible and Mass and emphasis on lay congregational participation. Both of these trends have by Roman opponents been called "Protestantizing."[32] There can be no doubt about it. Here is a "secret reformation."[33] Some high church Lutherans in Germany have said, "If Luther were to return today . . . he would be amazed to find a Roman Church which he would never have attacked as it is seen today."[34]

The Uniates and the continuation of the Byzantine rite in point of fact recognized the need for concessions on the use of the vernacular as early as the sixteenth century. Benedict XIV in 1742, and again in 1755, invited the Greeks to become Catholics without becoming Latins. This distinction is still pertinent.[35] The purpose behind the establishment of the Pontifical Oriental Institute (where today Jews and Protestants study, and which has published several of Arthur Vööbus' articles) was to encourage the Eastern Orthodox to unite with Rome. Only gradually did it become an Orientalist's graduate school and research center. The best summary of the history and the arguments of the vernacularists is in the symposium edited by R. A. Cunliffe.[36] The first chapter notes the increased number of concessions which have been allowed for the vernacular Mass over the years. Eleven liturgical languages are permitted to the various Uniate rites. After the first great sweep of Uniate reunions we jump to more modern times. In 1920 the Czechs were permitted the vernacular for certain occasions. The Chinese mission field has had several concessions—first in 1307,

31 M. Ducey, "The National Liturgical Weeks and American Benedictines," in *American Benedictine Review,* VI, pp. 156 ff.; VIII, pp. 235 ff.

32 G. Barrois, "Roman Catholicism: New Look in Doctrine," and J. V. L. Casserley, "The Significance of the Liturgical Movement," both in *Religion in Life,* Spring, 1960, pp. 167 ff., 211 ff.

33 Koenker's phrase, *op. cit.,* p. 69.

34 Messinger, quoted by Koenker, *op. cit.,* p. 199.

35 Donald Attwater, *Christian Churches of the East,* I, p. 18.

36 *English in the Liturgy,* 1956; a summary of the arguments appears in *America,* August 20, 1960, pp. 556 ff.

reaffirmed in 1615, then withdrawn and not renewed until 1949. The French Jesuit missionaries to the American Indians had the concession from the very beginning of their work. In 1943 approval for German vernacular Mass was granted on request of the majority of bishops. This was soon extended to Austria, Switzerland, Luxemburg. A 1950 petition for all German, and only German, Masses has not yet been acted upon. In 1947 the new French ritual added more vernacular sections than previously used, and in 1954 more English was added to the United States Latin rite. In 1955 permission was given the Ruthenian (Byzantine-Eastern) rite in America to use English for a sung Mass. Most unusual was permission on September 15, 1955, for Fulton Sheen, a Latin Catholic, to celebrate this Ruthenian Mass in English.

Many other exemptions or concessions have been made for various mission fields in Asia and Africa.[37] The International Liturgical Congress held in Holland in 1959 discussed at length the problem of missions without the concession of the vernacular. It is reported that permission to use the vernacular on mission fields for Baptism is generally granted but that too many priests do not take advantage of it.[38] In 1954 this concession was granted in the United States for Baptism and marriage, retaining Latin only for the most essential parts.

It is interesting to note the evolution of the concept of Latin as a "sacred language." In 1956 it was considered almost universally by English-speaking Catholics to be a sacred language. In 1958 McKenzie questioned whether or not Latin is a sacred tongue. In 1960 LaFarge categorically denied that Latin is a sacred language; in fact it became a liturgical language when it was a vernacular Mass.[39]

Lay participation has been given a great impetus. Hardly a month goes by without *Our Sunday Visitor* and other periodicals for the laity having one or more articles on this subject. It is interesting to note that Protestants are blamed for keeping Roman Catholics from full lay participation. Participation, singing, etc., have been considered a Protestant tradition and therefore (especially in a pluralistic society such as ours) Roman Catholics should avoid it.[40] One of the strongest

37 B. Griffiths, "The Language of a Mission," in *Blackfriars*, January-February, 1960, pp. 20 ff.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 25.
39 *America*, August 20, 1960, p. 558.
40 B. Ehrmann, *Report of North American Liturgical Conference*, 1956 (London, Ont.), p. 21.

rguments for the use of the vernacular in the liturgy is this new mphasis on lay participation. However, there are many who say that ith proper instruction, especially in parochial school, participation in atin is good enough, if not best.[41]

In October, 1958, Pius XII gave to this phase of the liturgical ovement his own endorsement and encouragement. Latin was still eld to be the normal liturgical language in the West. But Pius XII ncouraged lay participation. He invited all participants to chant at igh Mass with the choirs, and at Low Mass to recite at least he Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, and Pater Noster. He also ade provision for the dialogue Mass.[42] He warned that private cts of piety during the Mass were out of order and incorrect, although e did not go so far as to prohibit them under pain of excommunica- ion as some of the reformers would have desired. Instruction in the lass was to be given to the faithful, and a few limitations were set n the narration Mass.

The "priesthood of the laity" is now a common subject in diocesan apers and at liturgical conferences. Again, Protestant teaching is laimed for Roman defensiveness. So on July 17, 1960, Bouyer is re- orted to have said, "Many American Catholics think active participa- ion is something Protestant." Monsignor Sherry reported the startled eaction of many Roman laymen: "This line of reasoning sounds almost ike a Protestant preacher inveighing against the exterior worship of he Romanist Church."[43] "Properly understood and limited, it is true hat every Christian is a priest, having the power to do at Mass what he ordained priest puts in his hands to do, to offer up with Christ His Body and Blood and themselves with it."[44] To many this may sound ike a new doctrine or a Protestant innovation. Yet "far from intro- lucing a new doctrine Pope Pius XII was only repeating in his en- yclical what the first pope said in his first encyclical."[45] All people are n that encyclical urged to active participation, to answer the words of he priest, to sing hymns, and to respond. The 1958 instruction has been

41 J. J. Coyne, in Cunliffe, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 ff.
42 Reported in *Our Sunday Visitor,* October 19, 1958.
43 NCW release of Bouyer's address. R. S. Sherry, in *Our Sunday Visitor,* August 7, 1960.
44 Ehrmann, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
45 Meaning I Peter 2:5-9. "Instruction of September 3, 1958," reported in *Our Sunday Visitor,* November 15, 1959. The encyclical referred to is *Mediator Dei,* November 20, 1947.

called "the Magna Carta for the active, intelligent participation of the faithful in *their* divine sacrifice."[46]

So the emphasis is put on community and corporate worship, and liturgical leaders are pushing it strongly.[47] Renewed emphasis placed on the sacraments results in a corresponding subordination, if not ultimate abandonment, of sacramentals. Contingent with this are attacks on sentimental, rococo, gingerbread art and architecture seen in churches, chapels, stations of the cross, and especially Sacred Heart statues. A 1960 instruction makes clear even further the intention of the pope. "Only liturgical acts" are approved during the Mass. The rosary is not to be said publicly during the Mass. Nothing is said about private use of the rosary during Mass, but some hope to eliminate it from the time of the Mass. John XXIII in his folksy way has talked of those lay people who participate in Mass "like telephone poles." To help overcome this lay withdrawal, many techniques are being used, such as narration Mass, dialogue Mass, explanation cards, film strips and records.

The dialogue Mass is the fullest step of lay participation suggested by Pius XII. His instruction of 1958 has taken hold in many parishes, at least for one Mass each Sunday. Priests are reminded to speak clearly so that all may hear (loudspeakers are encouraged by the papal instruction). The Lord's Prayer is to be said jointly by priest and people after the successful experiment of the 1955 Good Friday change. Explanations of the Scriptures used in the liturgy are to be made. With such participation the vernacularists note that the unity of the church is no longer dependent upon the uniform or universal use of Latin but on participation in the mystical body of Christ.

These liturgical reforms involve the re-establishment of the hymn and the sermon in Roman worship. A new hymnbook was recently published in Germany. Significantly it includes "A Mighty Fortress"; the Lutheran hymn is sometimes highly appreciated and recommended.[48] New dialogue Mass cards published with the imprimatur of Bishop Alter of Cincinnati include three hymns and the suggestion that they be alternated monthly. The opening hymn, printed with music, is by

46 Sherry, *OSV*, August 7, 1960, p. 4.
47 D. Hickey, "The Liturgy: A School of Faith, in *Dominicana*, Summer, 1960, pp. 130 ff.
48 L. Bouyer, *Spirit and Forms of Protestantism*, pp. 24 ff.

. Neander, and the translation is that of Catherine Winkworth.[49] It s said that in Germany 75 per cent of the Catholic congregations now ing; in the United States the singing congregation is still rare. Those astors who have singing congregations are sought out and questioned t liturgical conferences. One parish in St. Paul, Minnesota, has sung ie Mass for the past fifteen years, and all concerned find that it contributes to the unity of the parish and to appreciation of the liturgy. Even where there is no parochial school or trained choir, there have een successful attempts to have the laity sing the Mass together.

The sermon is no longer limited to diocesan announcements or nancial campaign reports. Meditations on the texts of the Epistle and ospel are becoming more popular. "On all sides we hear today that is type of preaching, which is basically biblical teaching, because of its ividness, its concreteness, its existential character, has greater appeal or the modern audience which has little interest in abstractions. Moreover, this type of preaching is indispensable if the liturgical movement s to flourish in the United States."[50] Some have used the sermon time or teaching about the Mass or the Bible. "The liturgical week, the turgical apostolate, cannot but bring us back to the Scriptures, bring s back to a study of, a love of, and the preaching of the Scriptures."[51]

One of the paradoxes of our times is in this movement. The liturical movement in Roman Catholicism means vernacular, sermons, ymns, lay participation, and the Bible, while in the Protestant movement it means more clergy-centered worship, acts in which the laity s lost if not ignored, and the Bible is forgotten in archaizing medieralism. For example, theological and biblical themes at Protestant iturgical conferences attract less attention and attendance than costumng and medievalism. But as the Reformation sang its way through Germany, so today many Catholic leaders are confident that the dialogue Mass with hymns, English Scripture, and Bible-centered sermons will encourage the convert and attract the inquirer.[52]

Many other items have a place in proposals of reform, but for brevity's sake we summarize them. (1) Communion under both kinds,

49 *Report of North American Liturgical Conference,* 1956, pp. 51 ff.

50 E. F. Siegman, "Teaching in the Liturgy according to the New Testament," in *Report f North American Liturgical Conference,* 1957, pp. 70, 71.

51 Father Caroll at Liturgical Conference, 1956, *Report,* p. 11.

52 J. O'Brien and J. LaFarge, "The Language of the Liturgy," in *America,* August 20, 960, p. 557. Cf. Cunliffe, *op. cit.,* ch. VII, "The Conversion of England," pp. 135 ff.

permitted by intinction in Uniate rites. On March 27, 1960, permission was granted in Austin, Texas, for Latins to attend such a service and partake of both kinds. (2) Restored sense of pastoral responsibility, living up to the idealism of Trent. Every priest is to know every parishioner intimately and personally, with some hint that parishes should be limited to 1,000 members. (3) Baptism of a child and communion of its parents on one Sunday morning to encourage whole family participation in the liturgy. (4) Architectural study concerning the place of the altar, with emphasis on one central altar instead of many side altars. Some suggest that the altar be out from the chancel so that priests can stand behind, facing the people, for better participation in the sacrifice of the Mass. (5) Daily communion of the laity from the altar rather than from the tabernacle. This emphasizes the Eucharist as a meal, as many Protestant scholars are doing. (6) The Gregorian revival has been encouraged by Pius XII in 1947 and 1955. However, some problems have been recognized in adapting the Gregorian chant to the vernacular.

All of these suggestions and experiments, together with the major changes already noted, suggest that the Roman Church is not static. Minor changes—such as Saturday Easter Vigil, restored Good Friday evening service, Communion on Maundy Thursday, reduction of pre-Communion fasts—add to this impression. "These reforms constitute the most striking fact in liturgical history since the time of Pope Pius V, and one may call them the most decisive step toward that general reform of the liturgy which all the world hopes and prays for."[53]

II

Personal growth and maturity can be seen in ability to accept oneself and accept others. There are signs that Roman Catholicism is reaching this psychological and theological maturity, even in America where it has been adolescent and defensive from the beginning. Except on the subject of parochial school support, there is evidence of self-criticism and acceptance of the real existence of other Christians.

The increasingly free use of such terms as "Reform," "Reformation," "separated brethren," "Christian world," and even "fellow-

53 M. Ducy, "International Liturgical Congress at Assisi and Rome, 1956," in *American Benedictine Review,* VII, pp. 101 ff., quoting Father Antonelli's summation.

Christians" is symptomatic of this new maturity. In 1941 Pius XII referred to "those not belonging to the visible body of the Catholic Church, [who] are near to us by faith in God and Jesus Christ." John XXIII referred to "the whole Christian world" (which in former days meant Roman Catholic world) and to "the faithful of the separated communities."

There is a belated recognition that if the Holy Spirit is in the church and the world, then the Reformation and the Ecumenical Movement must also be under the Spirit's guidance. No one has yet said that divine Providence brought Luther to the German scene, but it is implicit in much of the restudy of the Reformation period. In fact, Fulton Sheen is reported to have said that the Reformation was necessary and that (paraphrasing Gressmann's remark on Moses) if Luther had not done so, someone else would have started it. "We who have the faith must admit that 400 years ago the Church needed a Reformation because of the decline of the Spirit of Christ among its clergy and its faithful. . . . The protests of the reformers at that time were right" (NCN release).

There is a new evaluation of the background of the Reformation, of the medieval church, and of the Renaissance legacy. Protestants have always claimed that Luther opened the Bible to the people, and Catholics have usually countered with all sorts of statistics about the fifty German versions made prior to Luther. Yet the *Twentieth Century Catholic Encyclopedia* reports, "The common people had scarcely any access to them, and that book which ought to have been night and day in the hands of devout men lay only too often buried in dust."[54] "By now the Bible had ceased to be what it had been, the living framework of the church's liturgy and the proper sense of its prayers, and thought, and inspiration."[55] This almost acknowledges the closed-book reports of Protestant historians.

Recognition of the immoral, secular life of the clergy and popes is being accepted more and more by Roman Catholics. Even Pius XII, in *Mediator Dei,* recognized the reality of sixteenth century abuses. The professor of history at the University of Notre Dame entitles a chapter of his history of the papacy "Decline of the Papacy, 1303-

54 Daniel-Rops, *What Is the Bible?* p. 16.
55 Charlier, *op. cit.,* p. 13.

1447."[56] He recognizes the need for reform of papacy and clergy at that time. Rome was a sink of iniquity. In 1517 the number of prostitutes in Rome considerably passed the number of married women, and in 1592, under the strict pope Sixtus V, there were more than 9,000 in a total population of only 70,000. "The figures are not indeed edifying, but perhaps they are interesting, not the least when one considers that during the same time the newly constituted Index of Forbidden Books was being used with extreme severity by successive popes against heretical propaganda."[57] The reigns of Paul IV, Pius IV, and Pius V are condemned. A few quotes of Roman thumbnail descriptions of some of the popes may be to the point. Sixtus IV: "In his reign, through the Pope's nomination of incompetent and evil-living men to high office, and his promotion of unworthy relatives, the seeds were sown of all the scandals that, for sixty years, made Rome the world's disgrace."[58] Alexander VI: "He was intelligent, prudent, and politic, but unscrupulous and a man of bad life, utterly unworthy of his high office. He practiced the most deplorable nepotism." Leo X: "An easy-going, pleasure-loving man" who "failed to recognize the urgency of the clamor for reform." He sacrificed the source of faith to considerations of party politics.[59] Paul III: "vacillating, personally worldly, officially zealous for Church and religion." Lortz asks, "How could a man like Paul become pope as late as 1534?" Julius III was a man of ill-repute. Pius IV was personally worldly-minded. Clement VII was the most unfortunate of all popes, entirely political. So Lortz concludes, "Mention has been made and will be made later of the fatal role of the curia in paving the way for the Reformation. . . . Shepherds guarded not the flock, but themselves. . . . Knowing little or nothing of theology, seldom or never reading Mass, many scarcely doing more than to receive Communion on Maundy Thursday in the name of the laics, [they] showed no concern for proper training of candidates for the priesthood. Their life was not only one of indulgence, it was even immoral; and these conditions were not the exception but the rule; the crassest conceivable contradiction to the religious and apostolic idea of spiritual office."[60] Lortz admits that for years before Luther there was doubt

56 J. Corbett, *The Papacy, A Brief History,* pp. 42 ff.
57 *The Catholic Mind,* December, 1956, p. 69.
58 *The Popes from St. Peter to Pius XI* (1938), pp. 25, 26.
59 J. Lortz, *History of the Church* (1956), pp. 378-380.
60 *Ibid.,* p. 311.

whether the papal church was the real church.[61] "We Catholics should not lose sight of the fact that the Protestant schism was not the result of chance, but the result of deep-seated causes, causes which were created in our church. Neither should we forget that God directs the course of the ages."[62]

The theological situation prior to the Reformation is now recognized to have been almost as bad. "The gesture of Luther nailing his theses against indulgences was a protest against a Pelagian deviation (which is still present today) in the Catholicism at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century which made of salvation a common merchandise."[63] The neglect of Thomas Aquinas' double understanding of the sacrament, especially as a sign, and the overemphasis on causality resulted "in an overshadowing of the role of faith in the popular mind and in a corresponding naive isolation of the sacraments as channels of grace. With what explosive results we witness in the Protestant rebellion. In fact, Lortz . . . echoes other authors in wondering whether the Reformation could have had such spectacular success if Trent's clarifying statement on faith and justification had been promulgated and preached and understood before the revolt."[64] "There can be no doubt that, in practice, sacraments were regarded in this mechanistic fashion by vast sections of the faithful before the Reformation. Superstitious use of the sacraments abounded. To all intents and purposes they were medicine chests. . . . Luther's denunciations of *ex opere operato* were justified if we recognize how that term was then widely understood, and I'm afraid, how not a few of our people understand it today."[65] Luther's strictures in the Ninety-Five Theses were largely justified by the abuses of the time. "In Luther's act there was very much that is meritorious and great: there were, for example, the Christian focus of his basic doctrines, his esteem of the Bible with its enriching influence also on Catholics, the dreadful appeal arousing the Catholics and their shepherds from lethargy."[66] It must be noted that

61 *Ibid.*, pp. 342 ff.
62 *Ibid.*, p. 558.
63 M. Villain, *Introduction a l'oecumenisme* (1958), p. 82. Cf. P. Hughes, *A Popular History of the Reformation* (1957).
64 G. Dickmann, "Two Approaches to Understanding the Sacraments," in *Report of North American Liturgical Conference*, 1957, p. 17.
65 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
66 Lortz, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

American Catholics are only beginning to use Lortz; the average priest still uses and unfortunately recommends Grisar.

This re-evaluation of the background of the Reformation is accompanied by a restudy of Lutheran doctrines in Tavard's *Protestantism,* Weigel's *Protestant Theology in Our Day,* Bouyer's *Spirit and Forms of Protestantism,* and Zeeden's *Legacy of Luther.*

Instead of diatribes against Luther's "psychotic nature" and his rough tongue, the newer studies recognize the temper of the times. "Luther thought himself no innovator but a man of the spirit. He had the innate conservatism of the monk, but was also a powerful preacher, sometimes adopting the tone of the prophet."[67] Luther was not a theorist; his problem was the practical one of the nature and role of faith. "Luther was very religious by nature. The decisive years of his development and his first entry on the scene reveal elements of unusually great religious value mingled with dogmatic errors. Filled with zeal for the honor of God, he was honorable in striving for reform, and despite grave doubts convinced of his calling."[68] In place of Grisar's condemnation of Luther's marriage and subtle hints at lustfulness, we read, "Why did Luther marry? Less than five months before, he said that he could not turn toward marriage. It was certainly not from passion and not to find protection from temptation."[69]

As these new studies suggest, the purpose of Luther was not destructive or diabolical. "Even Luther declares that his aim was not reform of the vices of the clergy or scandals, but the purification of the adulterated truth. . . . His invectives against the dissolute clergy were later dictated by the polemical situation. The revolution he wished to undertake was not social, political, or ecclesiastical, but theological, against the tyranny of error and of sin, toward the grace which he held and which to him was truth."[70] Most significant is the Una Sancta concept. "Many believe that the Reformation broke up the medieval unity of Western Europe. . . . However, the truth of the matter seems to be that the Reformation merely manifested an already existing division of Europe, a division it did not produce but which produced it."[71]

67 G. Tavard, *Protestantism* (1959), pp. 10, 11.
68 Lortz, *op. cit.,* p. 367.
69 Daniel-Rops, *L'Eglise de la Renaissance et de la Reforme,* I (1955), p. 354.
70 *Ibid.,* p. 331.
71 G. Weigel, *Faith and Understanding in America* (1959), p. 54.

Many Catholics have written honestly and without subterfuge on ae Reformation and Protestantism. Notable is the work by Kung, *echtfertigung* (1957), which treats Barth's theology and has started any a discussion and produced many an article pro and con in Prot-stant and Roman circles. Barth himself was compelled to write, "A ost extraordinary development is the fact that a young man from uzerne . . . has presented in a book razor-sharp arguments for the esis that between the Reformation teaching as now interpreted and resented by myself and the rightly understood doctrine of the Roman atholic Church there is precisely on the central point of justification y grace no essential difference! So far this book has not been repudi-ed by Catholic officialdom, but on the contrary has been openly lauded y various prominent representatives of that church."[72] Some of these octrinal studies are being made conjointly. Asmussen and Sartory in *espräch Zwischen den Konfessionen* relate Lutheran and Catholic atements on anthropology, Christology, and ecclesiology. Cullman nd Roesle in *Begegnung der Christen* include seventeen themes, each ealt with by a Protestant and a Catholic writer.

III

Finally, there is the ability to engage in self-criticism of one's own urch in one's own day. Many Protestants will deny this possibility o Rome. But reform in Romanism is not a contradiction of terms. here has been reinterpretation of the idea of heretical and separated rethren. "It can no longer be assumed that true confessing Christians re found only within the fold of the one church—as in the Middle ges; or attached to a given denomination—as in the reformed con-essional period; they are wherever man as individual has come face o face with Christian reality in the faith and has taken it on as the uiding principle of his life."[73] At the Brussels world's fair Fulton heen said, "Though the Protestants are separated from the rock upon hich the church was built, they are not separated from Him who laid at rock" (NCW release). Changes in Protestantism are welcomed as signs that our Lord and the Holy Spirit are at work among our

72 Karl Barth, "Recapitulation Number Three," in *Christian Century,* January 20, 1960, 72.

73 E. W. Zeeden, *The Legacy of Luther* (1954), p. 216.

separated brethren, sanctifying them in the mysterious ways of divine lovingkindness."[74] Tavard declares that Catholic theology is being expressed in less flexible formulas than those of the Counter-Reformation. This is to be seen especially in the repudiation of the Feeneyites in Boston by Pius XII six years ago. In the spirit of the Counter Reformation Feeney had tried to insist on the narrow view of "outside the church, no salvation." But already some seventy-five years ago Pius IX had allowed for possible broader interpretations of this catch-phrase. The leading Catholic ecumenist, Otto Karrer, to whom Cullmann and Roesle dedicated their work, wrote, "Our separated fellow Christians are brothers in Christ, thanks to the grace of God and Holy Baptism, the power of God's Word in them, and finally to the presence and activity of the Holy Ghost in their midst."[75] He asks both Catholics and Protestants to re-evaluate the norm of Scripture and justification by faith.

The debates concerning theological interpretation are continuing in areas other than the sacraments and ecclesiology. Just as there was opposition to the declaration of papal infallibility in 1870 and to the decree on the bodily assumption of Mary in 1950, so there is now much being said against the idea of Mary as co-redemptrix. There are also many intra-Catholic debates on inspiration and scriptural theology. Villain lists seven theological deficiencies in his own Roman church.[76] In the study of the Eastern churches Conger notes that transubstantiation first was used in 1130 and the theory of indulgences first was attested in 1016.[77]

In *Frontiers in American Catholicism* Walter Ong attacks the general indifferentism, secularism, and traditionalism of American members of the Catholic Church. He even sees that some of their actions and works give Blanshard an excuse, since many American Catholics have an almost pathological love of the past.[78] He notes particularly that some Catholics interpret the encyclicals, decisions of the Councils, and papal instructions as permanent, while others are willing to recognize that they must be given proper historical setting and there-

74 Tavard, *op. cit.*, p. 135.
75 O. Karrer, "Ecumenical Catholicity," in *Cross Currents,* Winter, 1960, p. 66.
76 Villain, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-167.
77 Y. Conger, *After Nine Hundred Years* (1959), p. 143, note 2.
78 W. Ong, *Frontiers in American Catholicism* (1957), pp. 17, 18.

fore need reinterpretation in every generation. Blanshard may rightfully "force Catholics to a practical realization that there are theological problems raised in terms of the reality which is America for which the answers cannot be found already framed in theology manuals."[79] This is evident in the 1960 Vatican newspaper report concerning the freedom of Catholic politicians and the traditional concept that a majority must insist on special privileges for Catholicism. The archbishop of Guatemala still insists on "priority and preeminence." President Kennedy's campaign speeches were attacked as heresy in some Catholic quarters.[80] The church-state doctrine is at the present time in flux. An admirable study was published by the World Council of Churches. One Catholic author is most appreciative of this study but laments that it should have been a job that a Catholic would have found attractive and necessary to do.[81]

With the election of Kennedy the subject of tolerance is not ended. The debate between traditionalists and defenders of freedom in a pluralistic society is far from over. Much of the writing on tolerance did not have the presidential campaign in view. McDonald insists that Catholics must become more clear on what they really teach.[82] He notes that all the statements of the American hierarchy in support of the constitution, etc., leave much unsaid. Two tasks remain: (1) elucidation and elaboration of the theology of toleration itself and (2) full and continuing publication of the extent of this theological consensus in the church. In conclusion he notes, "It is unlikely that the Holy See will furnish that re-assurance until the theologians have accomplished their traditional task of elaboration and explication."

Lescaro's article, published in France and entitled "Religious Tolerance in Catholic Tradition,[83] was not concerned with the American scene but noted that Pius XI wrote that faith could not be compelled: "No one should be forced against his will to accept the Catholic faith." But Lescaro asks why no clear practical developments have

79 *Ibid.*, p. 20.

80 Cf. *Ave Maria,* March 9, 1960.

81 Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty.* Cf. *America,* July 9, 1960, p. 437.

82 D. McDonald "A Theology of Toleration," in *America,* July 9, 1960, p. 437. Cf. G. Tavard, *The Church, the Layman, and the Modern World* (1959), pp. 38 ff., and NCW release in *Our Sunday Visitor,* June 26, 1960.

83 C. Lescaro, "Religious Tolerance in the Catholic Tradition," in *Catholic Mind,* January, 1960, pp. 12 ff.

come from this principle. He admits the horror of the Inquisition, th vicious methods of the Counter-Reformation, the intolerant words o Gregory XVI and Pius IX. But he continues, "To work for a full satisfactory elaboration of this theology is one of the greatest task confronting the modern theologian."

Self criticism there is. But American Catholics have even invite criticism by Protestants and Jews. Weigel edited *American Catholic A Protestant, Jewish view.* The invited critics pulled no punches. I fact, so strong were some of the attacks that a reviewer in *Our Sunda Visitor* thought the book should be on the Index and prohibited to th laity. In the same vein Pelikan's *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* i praised as the most understanding critique by a Protestant, who ha almost succeeded in getting inside Catholicism. It, too, is condemne by many as unfit for the laity, and the recent Roman diocesan syno decrees make it automatically forbidden to the laity. A recent issue o a national Catholic weekly had an article, "What Protestants can teac Catholics," in which seven items were covered, with stewardship lead ing the list.[84] A more scholarly and ecumenical article encourage Catholics to examine Protestant theology so that the dialogue can be true two-way street.

All in all, there are vanguard movements and voices—biblica liturgical, theological, and even politico-social—that suggest the possi bility of reform in Romanism. There are traditionalists, fundamenta ists, and incipient Fenneyites who would make reform impossible an who aid and abet intolerance in both camps. Karl Barth rightly won ders which group will prevail.[85]

84 William Whalen, "What Protestants can Teach Catholics," in *Our Sunday Visito* January 11, 1959.

85 Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself

By Joseph H. Deibert

LET us begin by asking the correct way to construe this command to love oneself. The church and Christian theology have often given the impression of teaching that one should love God and one's fellow man but deprecate or despise oneself. This is an entirely senseless affirmation. In fact, it is pernicious. This is so for the following reasons.

First, God has created me. If God created me, how can I despise myself without arriving at the conclusion that God has created something despicable? Traditional theology would say that man made himself despicable by his fall into sin. Let us grant this, but let us also ask: Does this mean that God's intention has been brought to nought, that man, by the exercise of his own power, has succeeded in so corrupting a part of God's creation, namely, himself, that he remains forever despicable? After man's sin, has not even God been able to redeem his creature from utter contemptibleness? Surely this cannot be asserted.

Second, how can I love my neighbor and at the same time despise myself? Both of us are human beings possessing in common the same human nature. If I feel only contempt for myself, how can my neighbor merit love? Is he in his essence less contemptible than I? No, in essence he and I are the same, sharing the same fallen human nature. It is therefore completely illogical to demand that I love my neighbor but despise myself. In fact, if I try to do so I am deceiving myself and heading for trouble. If I try to love my neighbor while despising myself, the result will be that, in reality, I feel secretly superior to my neighbor for what I secretly feel to be my achievement. In the end I will be loving myself and despising my neighbor because at some level of my being (perhaps only in my deepest unconscious) I will feel pleased with myself for being capable of loving a being so unworthy of love.

Let us pass to greener pastures. The Christian must take seriously the whole of Christ's command. He is commanded to love God, to love his neighbor, *and* to love himself. The question that must be answered is: How can I love myself without falling into pride and egoism? The

problem is to find something in me which makes me worthy of love which will not at the same time make me proud.

In the attempt to answer this question, let us begin with the creation of man. According to Gen. 1 man as created by God is good. Man as thus created by God possesses the power to rebel against God. At first sight it would appear that the possession of this power causes man to be *not* wholly good. However, let us examine the question more closely. Upon doing so, it is seen that this very freedom which man, as created, possesses constitutes part of the goodness which God observed upon creating him. Why so? Because without this freedom man would be a mere animal ruled by instincts or, worse still, an automaton. This freedom is in itself good, but it is a good which even God cannot grant without running the risk that it be misused. There are some things which even God cannot do. If he wishes to create man in one way, he is forced to abandon the option of creating him in any other way. None would deny that to be free is a good and that to be a puppet is an evil. When God in his goodness chose to create man with the freedom to disobey, he was forced to run the corresponding risk that man misuse this freedom.

The Bible declares (most notably in the account of the Fall) that man has misused this good gift of God. This fact is verified by all sound observers of human life. Unbiased observation of one's own life also confirms this fact. We arrive at the conclusion, then, that man in general and every man in particular—the only man that we know—is fallen man. The teaching of traditional theology is that there was a time in the past when man existed in an unfallen state, and that when our first parents sinned the whole human race fell into sin, for all subsequent individuals were contained in Adam at the time of his fall. It is impossible to see how the doctrine of the Fall can be taught in this way because if it is thus taught it is impossible to persuade present-day man that he is responsible, since no one believes that he can be held accountable for the sin of Adam. In spite of this defective way of teaching the doctrine of the Fall, the doctrine cannot be abandoned. This is so because the doctrine is biblical and because any sincere person can observe that all men, including himself, are sinners.

Yes, man—all men—are sinners. But the Bible clearly teaches—in fact, its central teaching is—that God continues to love even his fallen

creature. This St. Paul emphasizes with his words, "But God commandeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Here we have the answer to what there is in fallen man—in me—which makes it possible for me to love myself without at the same time causing me to fall into pride and egoism. It is the love which God bestows on me, although unworthy, which makes it possible for me to love myself with a sinless love. I may, in fact, I should love myself, not because I, in and of myself, possess some quality which makes me worthy of love, but only because of the fact that God loves me. The Christian should love that which God loves. Even the most inherently worthless and despicable object becomes worthy of the Christian's love the moment that God touches it with his love. In and of myself I am a worthless and contemptible sinner. Nevertheless, God loves me, and for that reason I may and should love myself.

Let us return to think more about the Fall. The Fall is closely related to self-love. Adlerian psychology affirms that the basic cause of all of man's personality difficulties, his neuroses and psychoses, is his urge to dominate. These are all arrangements (many of them very devious ones and practically all of them unconscious ones) which permit the person the feeling that he is dominating others. The basic desire of the person is to be independent, to dominate, to be on top. This seems to accord well with the biblical idea. The serpent incites Eve by telling her that if she eats of the fruit she shall "be as God." Eve succumbs to the temptation. The basic cause of the on-going catastrophe which originated (according to traditional theology) in Eve's act is seen in her desire to get out from under, to rise, to cease being weak and dependent, to "be as God." If we leave out of account the question of the historicity of Eve's act, it would appear that the biblical teaching and the affirmation of Adlerian psychology agree. Man's predicament stems from his desire to be independent, from his drive for power.

The connection between the foregoing and self-love should now be evident. This urge of man to dominate indicates that man feels that there is something within him which is worthy of the attention, the respect, the love of himself and others. He feels that he is worthy of this privileged position. The fatal error of man is to feel that he, in and by himself, independently of God, possesses this quality. This is the self-aggrandizement, the self-love that is egoistical and sinful. When

man feels that he, in and by himself, is a worthy object of love, he is in reality seeking to rise above his creatureliness, to raise himself to the level of God, to "be as God," who alone is inherently worthy of love. This is original sin, the primal cause of man's predicament.

Psychology also affirms that it is necessary to the well-being of man that he be able to accept himself, that he possess self-respect. It appears to follow that the consuming urge to dominate which has been mentioned stems in turn from this need. If one reflects upon the story of Eve, it can be seen that she, after thinking over the words of the serpent, came to the conclusion that in comparison with God she was weak and insignificant. As a consequence she lost her self-respect. This she hoped to regain by eating the fruit in order to raise herself to the level of God and thus regain her self-respect. If we examine man in general, the same phenomenon can be observed. Upon comparing himself with those about him, the individual feels weak and insignificant. This he cannot stand and therefore he resorts to all sorts of stratagems (most of them unconscious) such as hypochondria, scrupulosity, libertinism, excessive humility, and countless others in order to elevate himself over his fellows and be able thus to respect himself.

This basic need of man to accept himself, to possess self-respect, is in accord with Christ's command to love one's self. The command to love one's self presupposes that there is something about one which makes one worthy of this love. Man's error is not the desire to accept, respect, and love himself. This is a basic need of man as created by God, a need which Christ takes for granted when he says "love . . . thyself." The error is rather that man adduces an erroneous reason for loving himself. He labors under the misapprehension that he, independently of any outside factor, must be worthy of respect and love; he wishes to declare his independence of everyone—even of his Creator. It is here that the Gospel supplies the solution to man's basic problem. The Gospel gives man the correct reason, the only sound reason, for respecting and loving himself. It tells him that he is undoubtedly worthy of respect and love, not in and by himself, but because of the fact that God loves him. He becomes worthy of love because he has been touched by God's love.

Traditionally the church and theology have condemned man as being worthy only of contempt. Calvin in his *Institutes* (II, 1, 8) states

that "everything in man, the understanding and will, the soul and body, is polluted." In defining original sin Quenstedt says that it includes "the dreadful corruption and depravity of human nature and all its powers," it excludes all men "from the grace of God and eternal life, and subjects them to temporal and eternal punishments, unless they be born again of water and the Spirit and obtain the remission of their sins through Christ" (Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology,* p. 250). Innumerable other examples of similar statements could be cited. I have no intention of contradicting this view of man. Quite the contrary, I am in agreement with it. What I do wish to point out, however, is that it is plain to see that in such a creature there is absolutely nothing worthy of respect or love. Over-emphasis of this point, to use one's most vivid colors in painting this picture, can lead only to masochism or to sadism and tyranny or to the pitiful arrangements noted by Adler whereby man attempts to fool himself into believing that he is worthy of respect and love.

My thesis is that one's brightest colors must be saved for painting the picture of the love of God to *all,* including the fallen, unconverted sinner. God bestows his love even on him, and thus even he becomes worthy of his own and others' respect and love. It is useless to exhort a man to exercise *agape.* Psychology, experience, and theology itself all insist that this is impossible for man, that only God is capable of loving an object which is completely devoid of any quality which could evoke love. In order for man to love, there must be something in the love object which can call love forth. The Gospel tells us to love our fellow man and to love ourselves. In and by ourselves my neighbor and I are both fallen sinners whose state Calvin and Quenstedt and many others have accurately described. How can I possibly fulfill the divine command to love this creature? In order to be able to do so, I must find something in it which can evoke my love. This something is the love which God grants to my neighbor and to me in our fallen state and thereby makes it possible and necessary for me to love both.

We must now ask how anybody can be brought to realize that both he and others are worthy of being loved, and, more important still, we must ask how anybody can be made to understand the correct reason for their being worthy of love. Man can arrive at this understanding only by experiencing in his own person unconditioned acceptance and unconditioned love, experiencing the fact that another accepts

and loves him unconditionally, just as he is, regardless of how corrupt and depraved he may be. It is then, and only then, that he learns truly to accept and love himself; it is only then that his self-love is free of egoism and sin; it is only then that he fulfills Christ's command, "Thou shalt love thyself." Any other manifestation of self-respect and self-love arises from a poisoned spring and produces egoism, tyranny, contempt for others, or one of the innumerable neurotic arrangements mentioned by Adler.

This Other who bestows upon man unconditioned acceptance and love is God. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8), and "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (I Tim. 1:15). It was this which scandalized the scribes and Pharisees—that Christ accepted and loved sinners just as they were. It was this unconditioned love that Christ manifested which evoked in sinners love for him. Love begets love. Nothing else can. "We love him because he first loved us" (I John 4:19). Yes, it is God's unconditional acceptance and love for us which confers upon us the necessary quality which makes it possible to have a true respect and love for ourselves. It is thus that we are freed from the bondage of sin—the manifold ills which result when man indulges in self-aggrandizement and self-love based on erroneous motives.

This is the wonderful miracle wrought by God's *agape*. But how does one become aware of this love? It is the pastor in the pastoral situation who must try to make it plain to the troubled person who confronts him. He does not make light of sin or of its symptomatic manifestations as seen in the faults and misdeeds of the sinner. Quite the contrary, he is keenly aware of their seriousness. The sinner himself, in his innermost self, is equally or more keenly aware of their seriousness. Upon observing, during the counseling process, the pastor's full acceptance of him and genuine love for him in spite of everything, the counselee feels reflected the *agape* of God. He comes to understand that God loves him just as he is, unconditionally. The scales fall from his eyes and he sees himself for the first time as he really is: a contemptible sinner, yet the recipient of the love of God, and therefore worthy of his own respect and love. The poisonous spring becomes pure and he can at long last truly serve and love God, his neighbor, and himself.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Spiritual Therapy. By Richard K. Young and Albert L. Meiburg. New York: Harper and Bros., 1960. 184 pages. $3.50.

Books in the field of pastoral counseling are so numerous that a new one is exciting only to the publisher and the author. Most of the books are good, but they do not differ markedly from the many that preceded them. One wonders about the usefulness of such proliferation.

A welcome exception is this book which brings together material from sources not ordinarily accessible to the local pastor and adds the personal experience of a hospital chaplain. Each chapter covers a particular medical problem—e.g., heart disease, peptic ulcer, asthma, childbirth, skin diseases. Each chapter begins with a description of the disease or disorder written by or reviewed by a member of the medical staff at Bowman-Gray School of Medicine. This is followed by a brief explanation of any psychological factors which may be involved either as cause or effect of the disease. The author includes in these sections many valuable psychoanalytic insights which are usually ignored by writers in the field of pastoral psychology. The balance of each chapter is devoted to an examination of the methods which would be most useful in a ministry to these individuals. The methods are varied according to the needs of the individuals, ranging from something closely akin to insight therapy as practiced by the psychotherapist to the place of prayer and the Bible, the more usual instruments of the pastor. A brief list of reference works is also included.

The authors have recognized that there are interactions among body, mind, and soul, but they avoid the pitfall of seeing the pastor as another medical specialist. The minister's basic task is bringing individuals to a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. He must do this in accord with the basic physical and emotional equipment which God has given the person. The pastor must also have the voluntary cooperation of the person. By pursuing his basic task the pastor may hasten or further recovery to health, but that is not his primary aim. The authors point up the more active role which the pastor or chaplain must play in the care of the physically ill in contrast to that role which might be possible with the healthy person seen in the pastor's study.

My most urgent word of caution about the book would be in reference to the foreword written by Clarence W. Hall, senior editor of the *Reader's Digest.* In describing the work of Chaplain Young he says that three factors are of paramount importance, "relating, accepting, and listening." Of "accepting" he says that the pastor must "show no evidence of moral disapproval." This should not be interpreted to mean that the pastor abandons his role as the advocate of a moral order. It is expected that the pastor will not forget his own humanity and create a sense of isolation in the sick person. However, the pastor must always remember that people come to him for help because they respect the moral values he stands for, and they do not expect nor want him to forget that he is a minister of God, not a psychiatrist.

PAUL E. MORENTZ

The Rebirth of Ministry. By James D. Smart. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960. 192 pages. $3.50.

In ecumenical circles the office of the ministry is a major stumbling block toward mutual recognition, so that by now this issue has reached a sterile stalemate. But also in the functional areas of the church the concept of ministry is hazy and ineffectual, for what is the difference between the priesthood of believers and the ordained ministry? If we are all priests in our own right, why

---

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

a special office? What powers, privileges, and responsibilities does ordination confer?

This is a problem far beyond the confines of the Lutheran Church. James D. Smart, professor of Biblical Interpretation at Union Theological Seminary, New York, since 1957, has, I believe, given us the best delineation of this problem available in the English language. Nowhere in Scripture, he asserts, can there be found a clear line of distinction between the ministry that belongs to the whole Israel of God and the ministry that belongs to those who are especially set apart. The thesis of his book is that Baptism and confirmation are the primary ordination to the ministry of Jesus Christ. This does not detract from the ordained ministry, as some churchmen seem to fear, but elevates the special ministries in the ratio in which the "mutual ministry" of all believers is stressed. Among the chapters, progressing from "The Apostolic Ministry" to "The Rebirth of the Church," two are special gems, one on "The Teaching Ministry" for stressing an aspect often overlooked, the other on "The Christian Ministry in the Light of the Old Testament" for its profound insights. If pastor and people will study this book together we may well experience a rebirth of ministry.

WILLIAM D. STRENG

Marriage and the American Ideal. By Floyd M. Martinson. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1960. 491 pages. $5.50.

It is heartening to discover a social scientist who gives full credit and weight to empirical data and yet does not dodge the ethical and philosophical implications of value systems inherent in so basic a social institution as the family. Three "marriage models" are set forth: the *Judaic-Christian* ("regarded not simply as a pragmatically devised creation of man but as a God-given order," p. 37); the *romantic* ("basically a socially irresponsible model," p. 55); and the *rationalistic* ("rational mate 'selection' rather than the irrational process of 'falling in love' is the appropriate basis for marriage, . . . a conscious process of matching personal and social traits," p. 63). Meanwhile, in the background, these approaches are examined for their relationship to or lack of compatibility with the *American Ideal,* which includes three basic assumptions: "the dignity and worth of man, . . . the freedom of man, . . . and the equality of man." This three-part ideal is also shown to have relevance for our attitudes toward dating practices, the role of the working wife-mother, planned parenthood, divorce, the rearing of children, etc. The author makes a strong case for the proposition that you cannot understand American marriage and family life without taking into account the values and ideals that undergird them.

Professor Martinson, head of the Department of Sociology and Social Work at Gustavus Adolphus College, demonstrates broad acquaintance with the literature and researches on marriage and the family. An extensive bibliography is listed topically after each chapter. In style and organization the book is designed primarily as a college textbook and is admirably suited for that purpose. A couple dozen cartoons enliven a very human topic, which has all too often been treated in a pedantic and sterile manner by embarrassed and self-conscious sociologists. The warmth, sympathy, and integrity of the author permeate his balanced perspective and scientific objectivity. One has the feeling that behind this survey of the field lies a good deal of personal counseling with students. He quotes findings from several of his own researches as well as from many others in the field.

One appreciates in this analysis a careful distinction between various factors or functions that are often run together in common stereotypes. The "couple cycle," including the relationships from earliest acquaintance in dating through old age, averages 44 years, whereas the "family cycle," or period of having children in the home, averages 26.5 years. Different functions are performed in each cycle, and, although there is much overlapping, each has its own psychological and sociological principles. The author also distinguishes nicely between various kinds of dating and courtship, points out the values attributed to engagement by various groups, and shows how the various marriage models influence behavior and standards along the way.

The coverage of the subject is comprehensive, ranging from sex to money, from

legal requirements of the state to in-laws, from the honeymoon to divorce, and from family patterns of "decision-making" to the rearing of children. It is theoretically respectable and still practical for the young college couple who are "going steady" and at the same time enrolled in a course entitled "Marriage and the Family."

The book is recommended for solid study by pastors involved in marriage counseling. It would be a wholesome counter-balance to the "quickie" magazine articles and how-to-do-it kits that make easy reading but offer fairly superficial background for basic and realistic marriage counseling. Here marriage and the family are clearly seen in our contemporary American setting from the fresh vantage point of current sociological investigation.

DAVID BELGUM

Marriage East and West. By David and Vera Mace. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1960. 359 pages. $4.50.

This is a book about mate selection, marriage and family life in the Far East compared to and contrasted with family-life patterns common to the Western world. The authors are the well-known family life specialist, David R. Mace, and his wife Vera. David Mace has had broad exposure in matters of family life with intensive study, teaching, and counseling experience in Great Britain and America and extensive travel and observation in Continental Europe, Africa, and the East. During the past four years Dr. and Mrs. Mace have made two trips around the world on behalf of governments, universities, and churches and have helped to establish marriage-guidance services on all five continents. The Maces, natives of Great Britain, have lived in the United States since World War II.

This well and popularly written book fills a need for a readily available source of information on traditional marriage and family patterns in the Far East (primarily India, China, and Japan; primarily Hindu, Buddhist, and Confucian); how they compare with patterns in the West; what changes are taking place; and what East and West can learn from each other in developing patterns of the future.

The Maces sympathetically describe and place in proper sociological and cultural perspective some of the traditional practices of the East—the extended family, patriarchal authority, *purdah, suttee,* child marriage, foot binding—showing some values in the traditional ways while at the same time pointing out how they offend our standards of individual dignity and self-determination. They point out that the Eastern family is changing—in fact must change—but caution against a complete acceptance of the "free" Western system, including family democracy, romantic choice of mates, disrespect for parental authority, and sexual laxity. They plead rather for a middle road of personal freedom coupled with a strong sense of personal and social responsibility.

The appended section entitled "Marriage in Communist China" (though admittedly based on extremely limited sources of information) presents a balanced account and plausible explanation of some of the developments behind the "bamboo curtain."

Anyone interested in broadening his knowledge of this important aspect of life will find time spent with the Maces both provocative and informative.

FLOYD M. MARTINSON

What, Then, Is Man? A Symposium of Theology, Psychology, and Psychiatry. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958. 356 pages. $3.50.

This book is the third in a series of Graduate Studies, prepared by a special committee of experts under the direction of the School for Graduate Studies, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., Martin H. Scharlemann, director. Their purpose is "to serve as a means for helping to develop that quality of theological guidance and leadership which alone . . . can adequately cope with the problems and opportunities of the church in a rapidly changing and deeply disturbed world."

The purpose of this particular volume is to create a bridge between theology and the insights of psychology and psychiatry. It aims (1) to give a brief explanation of the

Christian doctrine of man for the benefit of non-Christian practitioners to help them understand Christian pastors and patients, (2) to set forth some of the basic facts and theories of psychology and psychiatry for the benefit of pastors and theologians not technically trained, (3) to make a beginning of the conceptional analysis of the relation between these two systems. The study was guided in part by the results of a questionnaire sent out to both pastors and psychologists (psychiatrists) which revealed the areas of question and concern.

The authors, all members of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, hold responsible positions as psychologists, pastors, teachers, or counselors. They are Paul E. Meehl, professor of Clinical Psychology, University of Minnesota Medical School; H. Richard Klann, campus pastor in the Greater New York area; Alfred F. Schmieding, professor of Education and Psychology, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.; Kenneth H. Breimeier, assistant professor of Pastoral Theology and director of the Field Work Program at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis; Sophie Schroeder Sloman, clinical assistant professor in Psychiatry, University of Illinois College of Medicine. The original and final drafts of the various chapters were written by one or more individuals in consultation with other members of the symposium. Full agreement was not reached on all points and some compromises had to be made.

The authors are certainly to be commended for this effort to bridge the gap between these closely related disciplines. They make no pretentions to having dealt conclusively with all the problems raised. This is only the beginning of a conversation that must engage the best minds for years to come. The basic articles are necessarily elementary and can at best serve only to introduce the disciplines to those not specially trained in them. It is not the intention to make psychiatrists into theologians or vice versa but to get them to understand each other. Three possible attitudes are rejected: (1) Theologians and psychologists are really saying the same thing. (2) They are dealing with two entirely different things and are therefore not in conflict. (3) They are in irreconcilable conflict. As a matter of fact, the interrelation is much more complex. There are basic presuppositions to be examined, some of which may actually conflict. There are semantic confusions to be cleared up, and it is encouraging to note the role that is increasingly being assigned to the analytical philosopher (not the logical positivist) in the performance of this task. There is thus to be worked out a mutually helpful division of labor. To this end this book should prove helpful, if only psychologists and psychiatrists inform themselves concerning the Christian claim with the same care that theologians do concerning the work of the scientists.

There are some criticisms, however, which it is hoped will be taken in the right spirit. By no means all Lutheran theologians will agree that the task of Christian theology is restricted to the logical analysis of the Word of God (the Bible) in terms of itself. This is not quite the same as saying that the task of Christian theology is to give a faithful interpretation under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of the revelation entrusted to the church in address to the situation today. While there is certainly agreement on the part of all Confessional Lutherans on the essentials of the doctrine of man, some things would be said differently. Particularly in relation to psychology the right insights of Kierkegaard (especially *The Concept of Dread* and *The Sickness Unto Death*) help to clarify the biblical view of man and of his predicament in sin. Here, above all, are the possibilities of building a bridge between theology and psychotherapy, as the psychiatrists themselves recognize. It is significant that the only texts recommended for reading in connection with the doctrine of man are Francis Pieper and John T. Mueller, although the authors themselves give evidence of a much wider reading. It is not fair to the rest of Lutheranism to present the time-bound presentations of these two men as the standard of Lutheran orthodoxy or of a theology that is faithful to the Word of God. This represents the view of only some in the world-wide body of Confessional Lutherans.

One other criticism concerns the painstaking way in which the conversion of Paul is analyzed in order to refute absolute de-

terminism and yet allow for a chain of events in a causal chain. Part of the difficulty here seems lies in the employment of categories such as secondary causes and direct supernatural intervention instead of seeing the relation between God and man in much larger interpersonal categories. The whole problem of freedom and determinism needs much more careful analysis. How do both the theologians and the psychologists answer the radical freedom posited by a man like Sartre? It is perhaps much more important to come to terms with a view like this than to argue with the obscurantist behaviorists who see in man nothing but a more complex rat. A view that faces the full anguish of being condemned to be free within all the limitations of a determined process is much more in accord with the biblical view of man and should present a fruitful challenge to both theologians and psychologists. It seems also that the changed attitude of the scientists with respect to the limits of their method of prediction and control is not sufficiently taken into account. But perhaps the psychologists have not caught up with the nuclear physicists.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

The Phenomenon of Man. By Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959. 318 pages. $5.00.

It is no wonder that this book is being acclaimed everywhere as the work of a great scientist and man of faith. It is magnificently written. It is as exact as any book of science might be expected to be and yet it glows with passages of high literary merit, even lyrical in quality.

The author was a biologist and paleontologist of world renown and also a Jesuit priest, and it is significant that this book, which sums up his life's work, was not released for publication until after his death. In it he builds the view of an evolutionary development into cosmic proportions. Evolution can no longer be discountenanced; the evidence for it is too overwhelming. "Is evolution a theory, a system, or a hypothesis? It is much more: it is a general condition to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must bow and which they must satisfy henceforth if they are to be thinkable and true. Evolution is a light illuminating all facts, a curve that all lines must follow" (pp. 217-218). It is a question, therefore, only of how far-reaching and all-embracing it actually is. Teilhard goes all the way. Evolution is the plan of the cosmos. Though there are many elements of chance, many setbacks and tremendous waste, the whole process is far too purposeful to be due to chance. The whole is the unfolding of consciousness which is latent even in matter. Thus there develop successive layers out of the energy that constitutes the basic stuff of the universe: first there is geogenesis developing the barysphere (central and metallic), the lithosphere (rocky), the hydrosphere and the atmosphere; then there is biogenesis developing the biosphere, a layer of the multitudinous forms of life enfolding the planet; and then there is noogenesis developing the noosphere, a layer of thought equally enfolding. The culmination of this sphere is in the unique development of man, of persons (hominisation). Man has reached a unique and non-transcendable high point as a person capable of love which drives him into union with his fellow men. But this does not mean that the evolutionary process is now at an end. The evolutionary process, as far as man is concerned, is only in its infancy. Everything points, therefore, to a further development of mankind as a whole.

There is in this development continuity as well as convergence toward the all-inclusive center, which is designated as Omega. The urge is toward unity, but a unity of persons. Man is not man in isolation, but only as part of mankind. It is mankind, therefore, that is evolving. And the twin-sister of mankind is knowledge, knowledge put into the service of mankind. "The dream which human research obscurely fosters is fundamentally that of mastering . . . the ultimate energy of which all other categories are merely servants; and thus by grasping the very main spring of evolution, seizing the tiller of the world. I salute those who have the courage to admit that their hopes extend that far; they are at the pinnacle of mankind: and I would say to them that there is less difference than people think between research and adoration" (p. 250). (One cannot help but wonder if this salute includes

the Nazi and Communist totalitarian devotion to science.) He sees for the future the organization of research on a scale yet undreamed of, the concentration of research upon man for his own betterment (eugenics, particularly), and the conjunction of science and religion.

Yet progress is not automatic and the future holds no guarantee of a paradise on earth. There are two possibilities, one of the triumph of the advances of science with a world of peace and plenty, rid of disease and wickedness. The other, more realistic and likely, is that of a growth of evil along with the good until the time when the organic possibilities of the earth have exhausted themselves (in the far distant future) and only "that percentage of the universe which across time and space will have succeeded in laboriously synthesizing itself to the very end" (p. 289) will be liberated.

With all this scientifically based world view Teilhard believes "the Christian phenomenon" not only to be in harmony but to be its ultimate meaning: the simple belief in a personal God who is active as provider and revealer, the redeeming incarnation, which is a "prodigious biological operation" in which the whole cosmos shares until God shall be all in all—all this coincides with the scientific postulate of God-Omega.

To this there is added a valuable little appendix on "the space and part of evil in a world of evolution," in which the evils of disorder and failure, of decomposition, of solitude and anxiety, and of work and effort are briefly mentioned in order to offset the accusation of false optimism.

This book impresses this reviewer as a valuable antidote to too much present pessimism. It is profoundly moving, inspiring, and yet disturbing. It is a typically Roman Catholic book in spite of the difficulties it encountered with the hierarchy. It exploits to the full the analogy of being. One cannot help draw the conclusion that it is more Greek than biblical. The only love of which there is mention is undoubtedly *eros,* the love of attraction by which men are drawn up into the mystic union. There is a primary emphasis upon thought, to which even love seems to be subservient. The fiery furnace of God's love *(agape)* which holds full communion with the sinner on this earth is lacking. All is of one piece with the whole Roman Catholic view of a quantitative increment toward blessedness through infusion of grace rather than of radical discontinuity and decisive breakthrough. In the end the whole book does not contain a single uniquely Christian word. It remains entirely on the level of what Kierkegaard called the religion of immanence (the universally human).

This leads one to wonder if non-Roman, and particularly Lutheran, theology has any answer to this powerful, challenging world view which has both eyes open to the findings of science. It will not have it unless it develops, without surrender of the biblical categories, a proper doctrine of grace in nature. Luther's doctrine of ubiquity, i.e. of the God who in Christ redeemed the world, needs to be taken far more seriously.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

The Natural Sciences and the Christian Message. By Aldert van der Ziel. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison & Co., 1960. 259 pages. $4.50.

Three years ago the pastors representing the National Lutheran Council and the Missouri Synod on the campus of the University of Minnesota arranged for a series of lectures to ministers by university professors in various fields. With the help of a subsidy from the Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Company it was then decided to expand and publish some of the lectures under the series title, "The Lutheran Studies Series."

The book here noticed is the first volume in the series. It unfortunately has all the earmarks of an amateur production. Not only do numerous typographical errors disturb the reader, but the most elementary rules of bookmaking have been defied. Solecisms have been allowed to stand, and stylistic blunders of other kinds will frighten away all but the most hardened readers. A firm and patient editorial hand was lacking.

This is a great pity, for the author, who is a physicist and professor of Electrical Engineering in the University of Minnesota, has something of importance to say. The non-scientist will sometimes find himself be-

yond his depth in trying to fathom the meaning of mathematical symbols, but if he takes the pains he will be rewarded with a better understanding of science and of its relation to theology. Conflicts between science and theology have usually resulted, the author maintains, when scientists have gone beyond the proper sphere of their sciences to speculate or when theologians have denied the validity of the scientific method in its own sphere. Sometimes scientists have not understood theology, sometimes theologians have not understood science, sometimes both have held to an untenable theology. What is said about creation and miracles should be especially clarifying.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Myth and Reality in the Old Testament. By Brevard S. Childs. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960. 112 pages. $2.00.

Modern study of myth has been making a growing contribution to theology. Because the term myth connotes fiction and paganism there is often astonished reaction to the statement that there are mythological elements in the Bible. Yet evidence has been steadily amassing to prove the point. Even conservative scholars cannot well ignore a fact so soundly demonstrated. Indeed, in view of the way in which the Hebrews borrowed so heavily from their neighbors in many areas, we should be surprised if they had not included myths.

At first reading, the title "Myth and Reality in the Old Testament" might suggest that the author intends to defend Scripture against accusations of containing mythology. But he does much better. He presents the thesis that within the Old Testament there is evidence of mythology which was demythologized in the interests of a differing Hebrew concept of reality.

Well aware of the need for a good working definition of the term "myth," Childs uses the phenomenological approach. In so doing he rejects two other main definitions which have been extensively employed in this field. The first of these, which he calls the broad definition, lumps all supernatural beings or events into the category of myth. It reflects the viewpoint of rationalism. The second defines myth as a literary form, distinguishing it from other forms such as the legend or the fairy tale. This omits the deeper connections of myth with life. So Childs prefers to say that "the myth is an expression of man's understanding of reality." Spelled out more fully, this means that by means of myth man expressed his understanding of the present world order as being related to a great creative divine action somewhere in the past. But myth is not just explanation. Functioning in the operation of the cult, it enables man to actualize in the present the powers that were unleashed in the original, primeval creativity.

By careful exegetical study of six selected passages, Childs shows how mythological material present in the Hebrew tradition was handled to serve a differing understanding of reality. This was not done by erasing the myths. Rather, the later writers added to them or reworked them from their more advanced theological positions. In some cases, such as Gen. 3:1-5, Childs sees what he calls a "calculated tension" achieved by the biblical writer, who breaks the original force of the myth but leaves its pieces in his material to show what was overcome.

In a more general discussion, the writer contrasts mythological thinking as found in paganism with the biblical view of time and space. Concerning time, he says that in neither system was time regarded as a linear process. History is not chronology. Mythology, however, looked to the past in an endeavor to maintain the order established in creation. Hebrew thought also valued creation's victory over chaos. But it went farther and looked to the future when the disruption which sin had introduced would be healed and the reality of original creation restored. This was eschatology.

The Hebrew came to view reality from other presuppositions than the pagan. Therefore the mythological elements in the Bible had to be made subservient to the Hebrew point of view. But where lay the essential difference? Or what was the nature of the reality which the myth was made to serve?

The answer given is "New Israel." To understand it adequately, one ought to read the book. Suffice it to say here that this

reality was viewed with hope in the Old Testament and until the coming of Christ, who was the new Israel. Childs remarks that "this pattern lays the exegetical basis for sound typological interpretation of the Old Testament" (p. 82).

As books go, this one is comparatively short. More than a mine of information, it is a tool with which to work the mine of Scripture. The comprehensiveness and clarity of the treatment make it valuable for the pastor, who can make good use of his all too brief hours in the study. It will inform him on an important theological front. And it will stimulate his thinking on the question, "What is the truth which is expressed in the Bible?" which is so much more fruitful than the question, "Is the Bible true?"

HOWARD N. BREAM

Isaiah 1-39. By J. Yeoman Muckle. London: Epworth Press, 1960. 135 pages. 12*s.* 6*d.*
Isaiah 40-66. By S. Clive Thexton. London: Epworth Press, 1959. 160 pages. 12*s.* 6*d.*

These latest additions to the Epworth Preacher's Commentaries follow the established format. After a few introductory pages, the commentary is divided according to the units of material determined by a critical study of the biblical text. The titles provided for each of these sections occasionally reach a degree of poignancy that fits them for use as provocative sermon topics. The study of the section begins with a brief summary of the contents. Words and phrases receive separate attention if they involve a problem of textual criticism, translation, or interpretation. The concluding paragraphs are devoted to homiletical application.

As is fitting in a preacher's commentary, the historical setting of the prophecies does not receive undue attention. Yet it is never ignored and is always accurately evaluated, according to the present reviewer's judgment. Both authors show an ability to describe the historical and the psychological situation of antiquity on the basis of analogy with present experience so as to arouse empathy and, at times, sympathy. In this capacity the Rev. Thexton particularly excels. His homiletical sections are longer, and he frequently concludes a section with a line from a hymn.

Homiletical development always carries with it the temptation to distort the meaning of the text. These commenaries are largely free of such error. In interpreting Isa. 51:17-23 the commentator goes beyond the meaning of the text. Though the "cup of staggering" in the passage clearly refers to God's judgment, the interpreter looks behind judgment to sin and develops some moralistic insights that are good but without foundation in the text. A moralizing tendency exists similarly in the apology for hate in Isa. 34. Such moralizing and such diversion seldom occur, however. Generally the elaboration provides legitimate illustrations. When Isa. 6 makes the commentator wonder how the prophet could go on with his task after God promised ultimate disaster, a quotation about the climber of Mt. Everest is given: "It was probably easier for Mallory to die on the mountain, as he did, than to turn back." Then of Isaiah it is said, "This man has seen the glory of God. . . . To continue in the work . . . is hard. But to go back on his vision . . . is harder still."

It is particularly gratifying to discover the historical setting honestly presented for the Messianic passages. Sometimes a New Testament association is taken up in a fresh way. God's use of brutal Assyria for a righteous purpose calls forth the remark, "The supreme proof of God's power to use men's evil acts to further his holy purpose is the Cross of Christ." On the other hand, it seems somewhat far-fetched to compare Isaiah's symbolical act of going naked with Christ's humiliation. In general, the relationship between Old and New Testaments is soundly drawn. The prophets are seen to speak to their own time. Yet the prophecies are viewed in the light of Christ, and links with the New Testament are constantly suggested.

Some students will want more than these short commentaries can offer. Anyone who is interested primarily in preaching, however, will find sufficient critical data here, and a start for a sermon. The index at the end of each volume will also provide a guide for a topical study of Isaiah.

ROBERT MARSHALL

Exposition of the Psalms. By H. C. Leupold. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1959. 1010 pages. $8.75.

Any commentary on the one hundred and fifty psalms of the Psalter tends to be monumental. This book certainly merits that description.

Monumental pertains not only to its length and the labor represented. The author has given us a monument to theological viewpoints of generations past. While he refers frequently to the work of recent scholarship, he is so out of sympathy with more modern writers that polemics vein his entire presentation.

Introductory matters are given twenty-eight pages. The more or less standard subjects are mentioned. Authorship is discussed for over two and one-half pages. Historical situations reflected in the psalms are allotted a half-page. Current trends of interpretation rate nearly four pages, while Babylonian and Egyptian parallels to the psalms are given less than a page and a half. Scholars will find significance in these figures.

The adjuncts to the text of the commentary proper are also somewhat rudimentary. This is not necessarily a criticism, since the book was intended to be understood and appreciated by the educated layman.

The bibliography lists twenty-five works. Of these the more modern favorites of the author seem to have been those written by Hengstenberg (1849), Delitzsch (first edition, 1859-60; fourth edition, 1883), and Maclaren (1893).

There are no footnotes to the text. What ordinarily would be placed at the bottom of the page or at the back of the book is run in with the main body of material.

The single index is a subject index covering two pages and listing about one hundred and thirty items.

New translations of the psalms from the Hebrew are a feature of the book. They are sometimes periphrastic in an attempt to clarify the original meaning. In places the translation is influenced by theological presuppositions. From a literary standpoint the dominant impression is one of awkwardness.

Let us look as Ps. 23 as an example. The first five verses read:

"The Lord is my shepherd;
I shall not suffer any want.
He will make me to lie down in grassy meadows;
He will lead me beside waters of resting places.
He will restore my soul;
He will lead me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.
Even though I should walk through the darkest valley I shall fear no evil;
For Thou art with me, Thy rod and Thy staff—they will comfort me.
Thou wilt prepare a table before me in the sight of my enemies;
Thou hast already anointed my head with oil, my cup overflows."

The oddities so apparent in this treatment arise from the fact that, alone among translators, Leupold has chosen to use the future tense in rendering the Hebrew verbs, which are in the imperfect. His explanation is: "Consistency demands that these imperfects be rendered either as futures or presents. Though the Hebrew verb allows for either, the future deserves the preference, for on the basis of the fact that the Lord is the shepherd, the psalmist looks confidently toward the *future*" (p. 20). The final verse also deserves notice. It repeats the King James text with only two insignificant exceptions: "Surely goodness and mercy will follow me all the days of my life, And I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

The Hebrew translated "forever" is really three words meaning literally "to length of days." The Jerusalem Bible (1956), a Roman Catholic translation in French, gives this translation of verse 6b: "me demeure est la maison de Yahve in la longeur des jours" (my abode is the house of Yahweh through the length of the days). This preserves the parallel with "all the days of my life" in vs. 6a. It is also accurate. The translation of Ronald Knox (1950) shows what a sense of poetry can do with this passage: "through the long years the Lord's house shall be my dwelling place."

Whereas Leupold makes a solo flight of innovation in handling Ps. 23, he reverses himself and stands firmly on a highly ques-

tionable traditional translation in Ps. 22. Here is his handling of vs. 16. Translation:

"For dogs have surrounded me,
A gang of evildoers have encircled me;
They have pierced my hands and my feet."

Comment: "The very last line of the verse brings the famous words, 'They have pierced my hands and my feet.' This translation can safely be retained (see the Notes at the conclusion) and is the one statement of the psalm that most obviously points to the crucifixion."

In the Notes the reader is referred to Koenig's *Kommentar* and *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Why, one wonders, did Leupold not also refer to the lexicon of Gesenius, which has a long article on the Hebrew word here translated "pierced." It shows that this translation is hardly safe. First of all, the correct textual form is in question. To read it as the King James and Leupold do demands supposing that two rare forms occur in the same word. Secondly, even if this be done, the word arrived at does not connote being affixed to a cross, as Gesenius remarks. Its primary meaning is "to bore." It occurs in Gen. 26:25, for instance, which says, "And there Isaac's servants dug a well." And in Ps. 7:15 (written by David, according to Leupold) the verb appears in the clause, "He makes a pit, digging it out," while back in Ps. 22 the Septuagint uses at the point in question a Greek word which has the primary significance "to dig." Thirdly, modern translation shows the shaky position of the traditional rendering "pierced."

Now to a consideration of the method of interpretation used in the book. The dust jacket describes Leupold's interpretation as "both didactic and devotional." This is accurate. Throughout he identifies and emphasizes truths of a timeless nature, such as the wickedness of sin, the certainty of punishment by a just God, the blessedness of staying close to God.

Attention is also given to the historical method. Since almost half of the psalms are considered Davidic by Leupold, the *Sitz im Leben* turns out to be remarkably restricted. Some of the non-Davidic psalms are placed during and after the Babylonian exile. As Leupold believes that the Jewish canon was closed by 400 B.C., he naturally rejects the possibility of Maccabean psalms.

Finally, there is the matter of Messianic prophecy. Leupold remarks that in times past it has been overdone. But he finds a strong genuine element that cannot be denied.

Two kinds of Messianic prophecy are considered. The first is direct prophecy, that is, "from beginning to end an out-and-out prophecy about the Christ." However, this does not, in practice, mean *exact* prophecy, for "prophecy cannot be interpreted too literally, otherwise all prophetic utterances would have their inadequacies" (p. 197). The loophole this latter statement opens up is only too obvious.

The second category is typologically Messianic. This breaks down into two divisions, individual and collective. In the first case a king "in his own person portrays the truth concerning the Messiah and knows that he does, and the writer presents him with this very thought in mind. This does not exclude the possibility that the author himself is this king" (p. 43). An example of the collective typology is given as follows: "Israel is a type of Christ. What the nation ought to have been, Christ was. He realized in His own life to perfection what the nation should have achieved. Therefore it is not inappropriate to have various matters in the life of the nation prefigure the Son of man. . . . To be Messianic by way of type is one of the legitimate and important aspects of this type of prophecy" (p. 819).

The author links his typology with his theory of inspiration when he writes: "Let it be understood that the psalm that is Messianic by type is in no sense Messianic in an inferior sense. The providence of God is most manifestly displayed in this class of prophecies also. For in them the Spirit of prophecy so worded the things that the God of history had in His wisdom controlled that the lower level of experience of man expressed the higher level which would become reality in Christ. The whole Old Testament thus became a shadow of the things to come" (p. 44).

A concluding evaluation of the commentary must give credit for earnestness and industry. Laymen whose theology coincides

with that of Leupold may find much profit in his book.

However, it must be classed with some other commentaries on the Psalter about which A. R. Johnson remarked in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*: "In other words these are not the commentaries which are the most successful in enabling the reader to live imaginatively in that ancient world and to share in a realistic fashion the living faith which these psalms so clearly reflect" (p. 183).

HOWARD N. BREAM

The Secret Sayings of Jesus. By Robert M. Grant, with David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1960. 206 pages. $3.50.

American students of the New Testament and of the literature of the early Church Fathers will find reason to be grateful for the publication of this significant volume. Except for various articles which have appeared from time to time in periodicals and for F. L. Cross (ed.), *The Jung Codex* (1955), little enough has been written in English about the valuable Gnostic documents discovered near Nag Hammadi, Egypt, in 1945. It would be difficult to overevaluate the importance of these texts which promise to fill in an extremely vexing historical gap in our knowledge of the rise of Gnosticism and which now give us firsthand information about an early heresy of which we could heretofore learn only from the criticisms leveled against it in the writings of the early Church Fathers. Although the writings in Coptic texts have been known since 1945, only recently have scholars done any serious work upon them and made them available in translated form. German and French scholars have already been at work in this area.

At the present time two rather thorough studies and English translations of two out of the thirteen Nag Hammadi documents are accessible to English-speaking students. Early in 1960 Kendrick Grobel issued his volume on *The Gospel of Truth* which included both a translation of the Valentinian meditation on the Gospel and a commentary. Now, in this book by Grant and Freedman, we come into possession of *The Gospel of Thomas,* translated into English and accompanied by a scholarly introduction and commentary designed to aid the reader in appreciating fully the setting and meaning of the ancient writing.

Unlike the Guillaumont, Puech, Quispel, et al. translation of *The Gospel According to Thomas* (published in English, French, and German in 1959 without commentary and with very little introduction), the Grant-Freedman volume carries no reproduction of the Coptic text. This fact, however, does not detract from the work in any way. In a little more than half of the book valuable introductory material is presented. In it the nature and extent of the Nag Hammadi discovery are described, a brief study is made of oral tradition, of our canonical Gospels, and of apocryphal gospels, and various other "gospel findings in the papyri" are surveyed.

Perhaps the most valuable part of the introduction are chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7, in which the rise of Gnosticism and the relation of the Gospel of Thomas to our canonical Gospels are fully treated. Of equal value is the discussion of the literary methodology of the author of Thomas and of his Gnostic theology. After reading the translation of the text itself, the reader will readily agree with Grant and Freedman "that *as a whole* Thomas must be considered a Gnostic gospel." The emphasis upon a secret knowledge of the real meaning behind Jesus' words, the twisting and garbling of our Lord's sayings so that they agree with the ancient writer's particular theological point of view, the radical omission of anything moral in Jesus' teaching and the importance of "knowledge," and the negative attitude toward women (they must ultimately be transformed into men!) are only some aspects of the Gospel of Thomas which disconnect it and its thought from both the canonical Gospels and from early Christian tradition and faith.

At least one matter in the introduction will perhaps produce future debate. Did the writer of Thomas make use of our written gospels? Grant and Freedman here exercise some caution in their treatment. A number of Thomas' recordings lead them to the conclusion that at points Thomas surely did

rely upon our canonical Gospels, as, for example, in the fourteenth saying, where it appears that Thomas has revised a saying from Matt. 15:11 by an addition from Luke 10:9. But other alterations in the recording of Jesus' sayings make it difficult to determine whether our written gospels or oral tradition is being followed. While the possibility that "the Gospel of Thomas is based partly on written materials and partly on oral traditions" is thus admitted, Grant and Freedman nevertheless finally decide it to be "more likely that he relied chiefly on written documents."

Inasmuch as the longevity of oral tradition in the life of the early church is by no means a settled question, and since therefore it may well be possible that the Gospel tradition was still being transmitted orally even as late as the middle of the second century, when Thomas was written, the conclusion reached by Grant and Freedman will surely find critics. It is precarious to be even reluctantly confident where a lack of evidence presents almost no possibility for any kind of closed case.

The commentary, which is interspersed throughout the translation in the latter half of the book, fulfills the authors' two objectives. On the one hand it helps to explain the meaning of the texts at the point where they appear in the total work, and on the other it includes an attempt to discover the source of the sayings. The reader will find the whole commentary of real value—but only if he has first read the introduction!

The translation of the text itself was made by William R. Schoedel of the University of Chicago. It of course differs in places (sometimes strikingly) from the translation issued by Guillaumont and others, but that is to be expected. Translators do not always "taste" the same words in the same way or derive similar "flavors" from them. Yet in no case, except where lacunae occur in the Coptic text, is the Schoedel translation wooden or opaque. The sayings are numbered according to the system of the German scholar Johannes Leipoldt, who translated the work in 1958. Unfortunately this system of numeration varies from the one used in the Guillaumont translation. However, the plate and line of the Labib photographic edition of the Coptic text (from which both translations were made) are given. A comparative reading of the two English translations is thus made possible with a minimum of confusion.

No doubt, as further translations of other Nag Hammadi Gnostic writings appear and are studied, our understanding of the Gnosticism against which the early Church Fathers wrote will be deepened. One may expect that even the Gospel of Thomas, here presented to us, will be re-evaluated again and again. Yet for careful scholarship this book, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus,* can hardly be excelled. It is hoped that such a work will set the pattern for subsequent endeavors and thus avoid much of the rather popular but largely unreliable literature which was produced by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

ROBERT A. BARTELS

The Gospel of Truth. A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel. Translation from the Coptic and Commentary by Kendrick Grobel. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 206 pages. $4.00.

Students of the New Testament and of the history of Christian thought are greatly indebted to Kendrick Grobel for his competent and thoroughly fascinating translation and commentary of the so-called Gospel of Truth, one of eleven semi-Gnostic or Gnostic documents found at Nag Hammadi or, more precisely, at the ancient town of Chenoboskion on the Nile in 1945. The papyrus is the Codex Jung, now housed at the Jung Institute in Zurich, the only part of the collection which found its way out of Egypt. The remainder is now the property of the Coptic Museum in Cairo.

The importance of the library of Chenoboskion compares with that of the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran and its vicinity, but the process of placing it at the disposal of general readers has been much slower. One reason, undoubtedly, is the fact that fewer scholars have competence in translating the Coptic in which the books were written.

Prior to the work of Grobel the text of the *Gospel of Truth* was made available in an elaborate edition prepared by Malinine, Puech, and Quispel in 1956 under the title

Evangelium Veritatis. Photographic facsimiles of the papyrus, the text in Coptic type, and translations in French, German, and English were included in that work. The English translation was unsatisfactory, however. It was not a direct translation, and ambiguities in the Coptic were not always mentioned. Grobel has presented the English reader with a firsthand translation, and his critical notes add immeasurably to an understanding of the problems involved in interpretation and use of the document.

Two references in Irenaeus' writings (*Against Heresies* II, 24, 6 and III, 11, 9) explicitly identify the find as the Gospel of Truth, which he names in refuting Valentinian claims, according to Grobel. Most likely the document comes from Valentinus or some Christian-Gnostic predecessor. Professor Grobel is not adamant in pressing his view but his presentation of the evidence favors it. In any case we have in the document a primary source for analysis of the Valentinian teaching and its developments which to this time have been known only by a few fragments and the criticism of orthodox writers of the early church. The *Gospel of Truth* is not a "gospel" in the usual sense. Its title is taken from the opening lines. It might more properly be called a meditation or reflection concerning the Gospel. It does not represent the extreme forms of Gnostic speculation. The Valentinianism it unveils might indicate that the movement has been judged too severely on the basis of later, grosser misinterpretation and misuse of the Gospel, a development unknown or unanticipated by its author.

The four canonical gospels were not alone in vieing for recognition and standing among early Christians. The *Gospel of Truth* represents one of many heterodox forms of Christianity eventually rejected by the church. Yet it bears examination for the light it sheds upon the history of Christian thought. Common terminology and certain striking resemblances of thought place the *Gospel of Truth* in a position close to that of the Fourth Gospel. Pauline motifs and allusions to synoptic sayings abound. Whether its author was a Gnostic who adopted portions of Christian tradition and fitted them to his own system or a Christian who recognized the value of Gnostic terminology and categories in communicating his convictions, the recovery of his writing adds another facet through which to view developments of his time.

Grobel's introduction of the work, the critical apparatus to his translation, the scholarly notes which accompany but in no way encumber the text, and the select bibliography he submits are a valuable addition to the library of the serious student and teacher of Christian theology.

NORMAN K. BAKKEN

Religion in Plato and Cicero. By John E. Rexine. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 69 pages. $2.75.

This monograph, by a Cornell University teacher of the Classics, actually focuses a spotlight on a narrow area of its broad title. The author's purpose is simply to compare the concepts of religion found in the work of Plato's late life, *The Laws*, with the work of Cicero by the same title. Greek and Roman religion, according to these ancients, is to serve the gods; but to serve the gods is to preserve the state. Religion is essential to the body politic. There is no use for private religion or private thinking that does not bring its piety into the civic cultus; hence the prescriptions against heretics in Plato and his fear of charismatic poets who might corrupt morals (and the civic mind and piety).

One might wish the author had let his treatise range into the later history of such a conception. That the task of religion is to be one integral side of the *civitas* was to be heard again in the Constantinian Christian Empire, in Augustine, in mediaeval Christendom, and even today in certain voices of patriotic piety.

Being narrow in scope, this book will chiefly benefit those who are already somewhat familiar with Classical religion in the works, for example, of Gilbert Murray and in Charles Norris Cochrane. For anyone interested in the "preparation for the Gospel" in the wide sweep of Graeco-Roman history, Rexine's work will be of interest. It does hint at the inner emptiness of Classical religion. As Gilbert Murray has pointed out,

the religion of the Greek states was inwardly bankrupt by the time of Plato. A historian of philosophy has noted that Plato himself did not mellow with age. His defense of Greek religion in *The Laws* is rather stringent and puritanical, whereas Cicero's attitude, though the results are much the same, has the practical Roman approach to religion.

One question on a matter of technique: Why did the author decide to translate Plato's Greek into English and leave untranslated Cicero's Latin? For one who does not read Latin, the exposition of Cicero's thought by the author can suffice. At least, this should not deter anyone who wishes to read a portrayal of two ancient religious classics painted in small, precise brush strokes. For the broad, sweeping strokes, the setting and the wider implications, one can go elsewhere. This is a good monograph, but neither the place to begin nor the place to stop in the field of Graeco-Roman religion.

D. H. Zinger

The Christology of the New Testament. By Oscar Cullmann. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. 342 pages. $6.50.

Professor Cullmann, whose high distinction as a New Testament scholar is attested by the fact that he holds chairs simultaneously at the University of Basel and at the Sorbonne, presents an analysis of the meaning and background of the various titles with which the books of the New Testament refer to Jesus Christ. The attempts of the authors of the biblical books to grasp the uniqueness of the Christ-event with concepts inherited from the Jewish and Hellenistic tradition have little to do with the metaphysical concepts developed in the Christological controversies of later centuries. The same is, of course, true of those words with which the historical Jesus characterized his own mission. Whereas the learned theologians in the ecumenical councils argued about the nature or natures of the God-Man, about his relationship to God the Father and God the Holy Ghost, the writers of the New Testament were concerned with the actions of Christ Jesus within the framework of the history of salvation. Their interest was not theoretical but eminently practical and personal. They spoke of Jesus as Prophet, High Priest, Messiah, Lord, Son of God and Son of Man, and thus helped to make the overwhelming experience of the divine revelation in Jesus Christ meaningful through titles which had definite historical and traditional connotations.

In Professor Cullmann's book the titles are arranged and presented according to four categories: 1) those which refer to the mighty deeds of Jesus in his earthly existence: "Prophet," "Suffering Servant," "High Priest;" 2) those which refer to his role in the imminent time of salvation: "Messiah" and "Son of Man;" 3) those which refer to his saving presence in time: "Lord" and "Saviour;" 4) those which signify his eternal nature: "The Word," "Son of God," "God." Professor Cullmann follows the methods of textual criticism and form analysis. Every page reveals the amazing mastery of all aspects of New Testament scholarship which characterizes his earlier publications. But the final effect of this book on the reader is evangelical. Professor Cullmann here shows that he is more than an historian who can objectively explain the various biblical names for Jesus against their complex historical background. His supreme goal seems to be homiletical. Out of the analysis of the different titles and names Jesus Christ emerges as the one who is "the same yesterday, and today, and forever." There even is something meaningful in the fact that no human word can define Christ's nature and essence, because the saving power of God's final and total revelation is not that of a concept but that of the central Event of all history.

Not all of Christ's New Testament titles have survived in the language of the present-day church. Terms like "High Priest" or "Servant of God" had a vivid meaning for the Jewish-Christian community but they no longer have it for ours; therefore, these titles are seldom used today. On the other hand, the title "Lord," which goes back to the earliest days, as is indicated by the preservation of the Aramaic word "Mar" in the Greek text has been and still is the most meaningful title of all. The author shows that a historical ordering of the titles would be totally unjustified and that it is both historically and theologically false to assume

hat the Second Person of the Trinity has ndergone a kind of development. Later gen- rations of Christians have had neither a eeper nor a shallower understanding of the ature and the work of Christ than the arlier ones. He in whom God became flesh as, is, and will be the "Lord." But since in hrist the Lord God himself was revealed, he fundamental Christian mystery was pres- nt from the very beginning, namely, the xternal existence of the one who was born nd died in historical time. The Christian octrine of the pre-existing Christ is not an vention of later theologians trained in Hel- nistic philosophy. The "Lord" was God ready for the earliest believers. As Profes- or Cullmann points out, this identification, though mysterious, was less of a problem r the early followers than for the later urch fathers who tried to grasp in philo- ophical terms what for the immediate wit- esses was the unshakeable experience of e Divine Presence.

Therefore the last part of the book, dealing ith the titles that refer to the pre-existence Christ, is of special importance. The titles Logos," "Son of God," and finally "God," plied to Jesus of Nazareth, will for all mes be the touchstone of Christian theology. n them the individual theologian will show hether he takes the Gospel of the Incarna- on seriously or whether he tries to circum- nt this "scandal" by humanistic and philo- phical re-interpretations. The writers of e biblical books, as the author shows, did t flinch. The human man whom they called Lord" was for them God. And without the ceptance of this incredible fact there can no theology that can claim to be Christian.

WOLFGANG M. ZUCKER

nosticism and Early Christianity. By R. M. Grant. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959. 227 pages. $4.50.

The discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls d the Coptic library of Nag Hammadi in pper Egypt have made necessary such dical changes in the traditional views of rly Christianity that the non-expert feels ther lost when he wants to inform himself out the spiritual and philosophical environ- nt in which the books of the New Testa- nt were written. A new comprehensive handbook comparable to those of Harnack and E. Meyer a generation ago will not be forthcoming until the newly discovered and only partially edited material is fully analyzed. In the meantime more or less preliminary studies must fill the gap. This is the value of the short and easily readable book by Professor Grant of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago.

It has long been recognized how strongly the various forms of Gnosticism dominated the intellectual and religious life of late Hellenistic culture. Formcritical studies have shown that some of this influence was also exerted upon several books of the New Testament, although many passages are clearly directed against the teachings of the Gnostics. The abundance of Eastern mythological elements combined with the cosmological and ethical speculations of Greek philosophy persuaded most scholars of the past to seek the origin of Gnosticism either in the dualistic religion of Iran or in the salvation doctrines of Stoicism and Neo-Platonism. Professor Grant, without denying the strong influence of both sources, seems to be inclined, on the basis of the new documents, to attribute greater significance to heterodox movements in apocalyptical Jewish thought. The increasing pessimism after the Maccabean period and the frustration of all political hopes of the Jews find consolation in a flight from the misery of temporal existence into the freedom and bliss of a secret world of eternal Powers. Knowledge of the nature and the function of these superhuman Powers permits the individual initiate to view his own frustrated life as meaningful within a struggle of cosmic dimensions. Such speculations stood in sharp contrast to the traditional Hebrew religiosity. In the end they led, as in the cases of Simon Magus, Saturninus, Valentinus, and Marcion, to a rejection of the God of Creation. The created world is now seen as the work of demoniacal forces, far removed from and even in opposition to the true and real "god" beyond all worlds.

For students of the New Testament the most important question is, of course, how much these ideas influenced the content and formulation of Christian thought. Where the affinity of New Testament expressions to gnostic formulations cannot be overlooked,

as in I Cor. 2:6-8, or 11:32, and in John 8:44 or I John 2:16, 17, the tendency is quite different from Gnosticism. The message of the Word that was made flesh is an uncompromising rejection of all Gnosticism. For the Gnostics the Word (Sophia, Shekinah) was not given to the world by the love and the grace of the Almighty God, but it had accidentally "fallen" or had been abducted and imprisoned in the flesh by evil demons. Such heretical teachings, which in fact denied the redemptive efficacy of the Incarnation, have never been accepted by Christianity. The scorn of church fathers like Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius to whom, before the discovery of the new documents, we owed most of our knowledge about Gnosticism, was especially roused by the fact that in the writings of the Gnostics Christ and the Holy Ghost were interpreted philosophically and allegorically. But it was against these very same misinterpretations that St. Paul and St. John argued. Our new knowledge that Gnosticism began much earlier than it was formerly believed helps us to see more clearly whom these biblical writers attacked.

WOLFGANG M. ZUCKER

The Holy Fire: The Story of the Fathers of the Eastern Church. By Robert Payne. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. 313 pages. $5.00.

For seminarians to react enthusiastically to an assigned book in church history usually means that the book is either very short or very absorbing. This one is not short, yet they like it. In his portrayal of the most important of the fathers of the Eastern church Payne has resurrected from the partial oblivion which the West has allowed to descend upon them some of the towering figures of Christendom's early years. His own intense admiration for men like Origen, Athanasius, Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, and six other saints of the East, and his awareness of Christendom's debt to them lie behind this attempt to atone (with a vengeance) for the centuries of neglect. His enthusiasm for these men is even greater than for the subjects of his earlier *Fathers of the Western Church.*

In a style that is dramatic, picturesque, and frequently beautiful, he presents his Eastern friends as colorful personalities whose distinctive insights into the Christian faith and whose heroic lives ought to be known and considered. If at times he overlooks their faults, give his imagination too free a reign, and fails to do full justice to their theology, he can be forgiven because the result is a book that fills a real need.

Of particular interest is the fact that all of these churchmen placed primary emphasis upon the personal and cosmic significance of the Incarnation and the Resurrection rather than on the Crucifixion and the Atonement as the churches of the West have usually done. It is sometimes puzzling, but more frequently stimulating and edifying to be reminded of this very old and very strong Christian emphasis.

Payne's breathless enchantment with the Eastern fathers and his ability to dangle them attractively before the reader's eyes whets one's appetite for more of their theology and may actually drive some readers back into historical classics such as Origen's pioneering systematic theology or Chrysostom's forceful and beautiful homilies. This "story of learned men, devoted to a sacred truth, walking with their heads held high in an enviable assurance, afraid of no man and in love with God" will be a favorite of many who long to extend their circle of acquaintances within the communion of saints backward through history to include the giants of ages past.

FRED W. MEUSER

God in Modern Philosophy. By James Collins. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959. 476 pages. $6.50.

Presentations of the history of the philosophy of religion are often unsatisfactory either because the author is completely out of sympathy with the subject matter or because he uses the history of thought about religion in order to promote his own theological viewpoints. In the first case the result is a kind of condescending astonishment over the fact that great philosophers of the past have wasted so much intellectual effort on pseudo-problems. In the second case the

uthor becomes polemical or apologetical and eases to be faithful to the rational commitment of philosophy. Professor Collins of St. Louis University, who in previous books on ontemporary existentialism and on Kierkegaard has already proved himself a historian of great learning and sensitive understanding, avoids both pitfalls in admirable ashion in this new book. His presentation f the development of modern philosophical hought about God is true *Geistesgeschichte:* n understanding of philosophy as a coherent tory within its own conceptual framework. his book may well become a classic in its eld because of its thorough analysis and its enuine philosophical ethos.

Starting with Nicolaus Cusanus and Giordano Bruno the author points to the proud nd desperate basis of all modern philosophy f religion, the autonomy of reason. This significantly modern claim commits the philosopher to the rejection of the truth of revelation as a philosophical argument. The reliance philosophy upon itself has created three pical positions: Scepticism, rationalism, and deism, all of which are symptoms of a ndamental estrangement of man from God. ll manifest the predicament of post-Renaissance philosophy which is too honest to use e name of God as a philosophical terminus, ut which is unable to establish the cognitive nd existential autonomy of man without ference to some transcendent ultimate Beg. Thus the history of philosophy in the st four hundred years is part of the great piritual drama which theologians call *Heilsschichte.*

The God of modern philosophy is not, owever, the God of Moses and Jesus. His ality is not that of the One who has acted the past, acts now, and will act in all mes to come. He has become depersonalized nd abstract. For Descartes He has the nction of guaranteeing true knowledge and e permanency of the laws of nature; for ant He is both the basis and the goal of eoretical and practical reason; in Whitead's philosophy He simply is the principle order. Such teachings were not necessarily opposition to Christianity, for influential eological schools have at times promoted em as the most modern and most adequate rmulation of Christian doctrine. Yet, in their very nature and intention they were not manifestations of the certainty of faith but desperate attempts to bridge the ever-widening gap between revelation and philosophical reason.

Therefore, the naturalistic atheism of Holbach, the social atheism of Feuerbach and Marx, and the humanistic atheism of Nietzsche were not simply philosophies without God, but they were all answers to the same predicament which Descartes, Malebranche, Spinoza, and Leibnitz wanted to overcome by rationalism, and Hume by the most honest form of scepticism. When Hegel, as early as 1802, dared to speak of the "death of God" he meant this not as an attack on religion but as a characterization of the modern religious consciousness. Hegel, better than anyone else, knew the implications of a radically philosophical attitude. Thus the chapter on Hegel is the center and climax of Professor Collins' presentation. Hegel's identification of God with reason is both philosophically and theologically superior to all other philosophies of religion because his system permits the Absolute not only to be but also to act as the power and principle of all concrete historical action. Here theology is completely swallowed up by philosophy. Revelation cannot state anything which philosophy cannot also state and even prove. The Incarnation and the Holy Trinity reappear in the Hegelian system as logically necessary concepts. Never was a philosophical system more complete, more watertight, than in this swan song of Western systematic philosophy. Never had philosophy believed it was so certain of the truth of Christian doctrine, yet never had philosophy been farther from the Gospel.

Kierkegaard predicted that all post-Hegelian philosophy would be simultaneously dependent upon and in violent opposition to Hegel. This prediction has come true in a peculiar way. Most philosophers of the last hundred years have been distrustful of Hegel, precisely because he seemed to have answered all questions and solved all problems. At the same time, through Hegel, modern philosophy lost its "innocence." After Hegel all philosophers had to reflect on their own philosophy and to justify it in the specific context of the historical existential situation. The consequence was a turning away from causal

explanation to descriptive analysis of meaning structures. Phenomenology in Germany and France, the linguistic analysis of the Oxford School, and the deliberate indecision, the "hovering," of Jaspers are different expressions of this tendency.

Professor Collins, in the last chapter of his book, reveals his own neo-Thomistic position when he views with regret and criticism this modern neglect of a philosophy of causality. He admits the necessity of the historical and phenomenological approach for any future philosophy of God; he credits the scepticism of the last four centuries with having helped to clear the ground; but he believes that any philosophy not based on causal realism is bound to founder, just as rationalism, scepticism, and fideism have foundered before.

WOLFGANG M. ZUCKER

The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr. By Gordon Harland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. 298 pages. $6.00.

Although in continual dialogue with modern society for the past three decades, America's most influential theologian has never had the time (or the interest) to write a systematic account of his theological and ethical thought. Fortunately for Reinhold Niebuhr, some of his dedicated disciples are now screening a lifetime's production of books, essays and articles in order to do this for him. Harland's careful study is one of the most successful of these attempts.

The book is divided into two major divisions. Part I outlines the structure of Niebuhr's theological ethic and Part II analyzes his views on a great number of practical issues in the areas of politics, economics, international relations, and race relations. In the course of the presentation, Harland seeks to defend Niebuhr against two of the most common charges made against him: 1) that there is no organic unity between his theological principles and his ethical practices; 2) that Niebuhr is strong as a prophet tearing down current idols but weak as a priest helping his people to worship and to serve the one true God.

One leaves the book with the distinct impression that like many another great preacher (for that is his unique calling), Niebuhr may be judged explicitly guilty but implicitly innocent on both counts. The strong bond which connects Niebuhr's thought and action is his insistence upon the mutual interaction of Christian love and social justice. Love demands, negates, and fulfills justice. Justice without love ceases to be justice and degenerates into a mere balance of power. Love without justice ceases to be love and degenerates into vague sentimentalism.

Nevertheless, in terms of systematic wholeness, Niebuhr's position suffers from a relative paucity of distinctively Christian resources in his theological foundations for social ethical service. Though his own spirit is evangelically cross-centered, Niebuhr's doctrines of the Holy Spirit, the church, the means of grace, and the relation of justification to sanctification are conspicuously weak. Harland does develop Niebuhr's characteristic treatments of humility, tolerance, irony, and the nonchalance of faith, but it is often hard to see what Jesus has to add to Jeremiah and Jefferson for such an orientation.

This helps to explain why Niebuhr feels that Christians, because of the church's past record of critical quietism and anti-Semitism, have forfeited their right to try to convert the Jews. It may also shed light on Niebuhr's persistent refusal to accept the findings of Karl Holl and the whole Luther renaissance in discrediting Ernst Troeltsch's one-sided criticism of the social ethical stance of Luther and German Lutheranism. In this debate, Harland takes a mediating position. "It is, I think, true that Niebuhr has not made the distinctions between Luther and German Lutheranism and between German and Scandinavian Lutheranism, that ought to be made, and that his description of private and public morality in Luther is open to a good deal of discussion. With these reservations, I think his judgment that the Lutheran Reformation failed to see the real relevance of *agape* to the struggle for justice is well taken. Luther did not think in sufficiently structured political terms for the nature of the relationship to acquire proper delineation. That this had some real evil social consequences cannot, I think, be gain-

said, nor does it dim the glory of Luther to admit it."

Hence, while Niebuhr is not nearly as careful about distinguishing between the law's civil righteousness and the Gospel's Christian righteousness as either Luther or Brunner (two of his favorite targets), it must be said that his ambiguity at just this critical point has gained him the hearing and cooperation of men of good will from all walks of life who can often agree with his social analyses and remedies whether they are Christian or not.

WILLIAM H. LAZARETH

The Spirit of American Christianity. By Ronald E. Osborn. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958. 241 pages. $3.75.

Anyone who attempts to present a comprehensive picture of American Protestantism must try to touch briefly on many aspects of church life, with the result that he cannot investigate anything in detail. On almost every page of this book a new characteristic of American Christianity is mentioned, as the author tries to indicate both the historical forces that have shaped American Christianity and the unique qualities that distinguish it from European Christians. Professor Osborn gazes momentarily upon the effect of the frontier, the significance of immigration, the separation of church and state, voluntary support, the kinds of evangelism, the role of the pastor, activities of the laity, patterns of worship, denominational divisions, expressions of unity, currents of theology, and the common faith beneath the diversity, to mention only a few of his concerns. He will probably be criticized for attempting to do too much, for being too shallow, and for saying nothing really new.

The book's background explains its character. It was originally a series of lectures for the Ecumenical Institute designed to give non-Americans a brief exposure to the spirit of Christianity here. It was "to report what American Christianity is, not . . . to contend what it ought to be." The author's determination to "bear witness to the spirit of our people" gives the book a personal warmth which a scholarly analysis of church life could not have. Personal interpretations, experiences, and reminiscences abound as he converses in friendly fashion with those of a different religious heritage.

Osborn warns his readers that he speaks out of deep commitment to that segment of American Protestantism that occupies the middle ground between the Episcopalians and Lutherans on the one hand, and the fundamentalist pentecostals on the other. The genius of our church life he finds in the fact that "quite apart from elaborate systems of dogma, a belief in Jesus Christ as Son of God, Savior, and Lord, has commanded the devotion of millions of faithful men and women . . . has resulted in strong, life-changing churches . . . has produced a strong ecumenical consciousness and a growing sense of mutual responsibility among Christians . . . has kept a large bloc of noncreedal churches as free from heresy as those communions whose teaching is protected by elaborate confessional symbols." The Christian faith of the majority of American Christians he describes as "primarily personal and practical rather than primarily propositional . . . a common loyalty to one Lord more important than peculiarities of sectarian doctrine . . . with theology in a subsidiary role to criticize our faith and to discipline our thinking but not to constitute an elaborate creedal basis of union." Although Lutherans may disagree with many of the principles in these descriptions we can hardly challenge Osborn's claim that they are held by the majority.

It is true that Osborn's portrayal contains little that is new or especially provocative. Even the concluding chapter, "Haunting Questions," simply rephrases the standard concerns that are voiced by Christians in many quarters over the virtual disappearance of independent thought from the American scene, the rapid growth of the more conservative and fundamentalist denominations, the genuineness of the return to religion, and the insignificant effect which American Christians seem to be having on the total life of the nation.

For the well-read critic of American church life the book will have little value. Yet it is an interesting, warm, personal description of American Christianity's spirit and life. Its total impression is positive. The few hours required to read it will be well

invested, especially for those who cannot take the time or do not care to deal with the more detailed and ponderous analyses of the religious aspects of our culture.

FRED W. MEUSER

The Watchman. By C. Edward Hopkin. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1960. 117 pages. $2.95.

To understand the times in which we live and to speak the right and relevant word is not easy. This book seeks to help the minister toward greater effectiveness in discharging his prophetic role. Father Hopkin, now professor at the Episcopalian Divinity School in Philadelphia, has served for many years as a parish pastor and shows a keen grasp of concrete problems in actual parish life.

The book is divided into two main parts. The first deals with the personal preparation requisite for the task and presents guideposts for a prophetic ministry. The latter are derived primarily from the New Testament but also from the insights of contemporary theological leadership. According to the author, the three most important causes of the watchman's unreadiness to speak are "the lack of factual knowledge germane to complex moral situations, the unconscious personal involvement of the watchman himself in the moral confusion of society, and the subtle skill of the perpetrators of evil."

In the second part, Father Hopkin analyzes the currents of thought and the social environment to which the watchman must address himself. "Optimism, individualistic humanism, negativism, materialism, the weakening of belief, the habit of dissent, and the loss of the sense of the holy—these are some of the influential survivals from the earlier decades of our century." He takes hope from the fact that "more recently, a growing cynicism, of a healthy sort, has been acting to cancel these survivals and to replace them with new positives in the common life."

Not all would accept his dictum that "the true is always, in some way, the solitary, and group action is always, in some way the untrue," nor accede readily to his ascription of only positive values to the mass movement to suburbia. Nevertheless, the book contains fresh and illuminating insights and will be of considerable help to the pastor who takes seriously his call to be a watchman.

JOHN STENSVAAG

The Providence of God. By Georgia Harkness. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 192 pages. $3.50.

Dr. Georgia Harkness, the respected professor of applied theology at the Pacific School of Religion, believes the relation of divine providence to human acts and choices and to the world of natural law is the "hot spot" of contemporary religious issues. She has written this book to explain and defend the doctrine of providence in contemporary terms. She attempts to show that one can believe in God on personal as well as on philosophical grounds.

Professor Harkness defines providence as "the goodness of God and His guiding, sustaining care" and says that "to believe in divine providence is to believe that God sees the way before us and looks after us as we seek to walk in it."

She claims to take her stand firmly on "Biblical faith and Christian experience." She writes, further, that "we shall in this book draw no sharp line between biblical and natural theology, for it is the author's conviction that since both are channels toward the truth about God and His world, there can be no basic conflict between them."

Anyone who has read many of Dr. Harkness' numerous books will discover little here that she has not said before. It will also be noted that fresh references to contemporary writers are mainly allusions to writers of poetry, drama and fiction rather than to recent or current theological spokesmen. It is the judgment of this reviewer that the work suffers from a lack of appeal to recent and significant theological works and that for this reason or others not apparent, Miss Harkness has done little more than rearrange her old ideas.

The basic issue to be raised with this book, however, is the willing granting of "equal time" to natural theology. Here Miss Harkness seems to be selling out to natural religion. She would have done well to take a stand with Luther (and others) who un-

sitatingly suggests that man can only see e hand of God in nature because he already ows God through revelation.

L. Dale Lund

gh Is the Wall. By Ruth Muirhead Berry. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. 268 pages. $1.25.

The appearance of this volume in a paper-ck edition is good news, for here is a novel ntaining an analysis of Protestant-Roman tholic marriage which might well be placed the hands of teen-agers and others involved the prospect of successful marriage across igious lines. *High Is the Wall* is better a case study in mixed marriage than as tion.

The story concerns the courtship anl mar-d life of Faith McLaren ("I was brought in the Congregational church, but now n Presbyterian. My mother was a Quaker d my father an Episcopalian. Rather a xture, isn't it?") and Neil Mackaig, a man Catholic.

Neil and Faith run into all the typical uations and some besides: lack of appreci-on of each other's religious culture (hymns, geantry, church decor, etc.); tension with rental families; controversy over the sign-g of the ante-nuptial agreement; differences er religion resulting in misunderstandings at would not otherwise occur; taking in-uction from the priest; the Catholic urch's regard of all non-Catholics as in-els; Father Corrigan's bad temper because o many heretics were in the wedding party, d in the sanctuary, too;" Neil's not being rmitted to attend church with Faith; the estion of a Catholic or a non-Catholic hos-al when the children are born; inability pray together; disappointment of in-laws er baptismal plans; the fact that Faith uld not take her children to church with her; parochial school versus public school; death of an unbaptized baby; Grandpa McLaren's funeral and the children's concern over the final abode of their (Protestant) grandfather; breaking of the ante-nuptial agreement in spirit anl breaking of the birth control principle in practice.

These situations and problems are handled in such a way as to impress the reader with their seriousness and the difficulties in solving them. In the words of Faith: "When people want to get along together and to make a Christian home, as both Neil and I do, wouldn't you think there would be some opening, some incident. . . ." But the story provides no "opening" or "incident" that brings Neil and Faith together. At the time they were dating each other and planning their marriage there was some awareness of a "low wall" that separated them. By the end of the book the wall has become so high and unscalable that reconciliation seems improbable.

To anyone familiar with the problems involved in a Protestant-Roman Catholic marriage the book adds nothing that is very new. One might feel prompted to ask, however, whether this "high wall" is the only "solution" in such a love relationship. In recommending the book to young people it is well to realize that the total effect of the book leaves one with a hopeless and negative view of the prospects for a solution. When recommending the book to young people one ought also to recommend James Pike's *If You Marry Outside Your Faith.* Pike outlines various possibilities, though by no means easily attainable ones, for resolving the problems of love across religious lines.

The realization that Ruth Muirhead Berry has children both "within and without the garden wall" adds a note of authenticity to her handling of the mixed-marriage problem.

Floyd M. Martinson